The Effects of Performativity on the Professional Practice of Principal Teachers Within a Scottish Secondary School.

Angela J. Drummond

Doctorate of Education
The University of Edinburgh
2010

Declaration of Authenticity

I declare that the work presented within this document is the original work of the author, **Angela Jean Drummond**, and that it has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Angela Jean Drummond.
21st January 2011

Table of Contents

Table of Figures

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to,

1. Professor Pamela Munn, who has kindly supervised this thesis and provided me with many invaluable opportunities to increase my knowledge of education, through her constant support, encouragement and patience. Professor Munn has given me the opportunity to make the transition from classroom teacher to education researcher, by providing valuable guidance and teaching throughout the production of this thesis. There is no doubt that the consistently high level of support given to me by Professor Munn throughout the Ed.D course, has resulted in transformational growth within both my professional and personal life, for which I am truly grateful.

2. The five principal teachers within the case study school who kindly agreed to take part in the research. Without their willingness to be interviewed by giving up their valuable non teaching time, it would not have been possible to generate such valuable, rich data.

3. The head teacher of the case study school, who kindly agreed to the research being carried out, and to take part himself. The research would not have been possible without his support at the outset, for which I am very grateful.

4. The education authority of the case study school, who have supported my research throughout, and encouraged me in my studies.

5. Peter Drummond and Hannah Drummond, my husband and daughter, whose unconditional encouragement and support have been without measure, and were central to the completion of this research. With sincere heartfelt gratitude, I dedicate this thesis to them both.

The Effects of Performativity on the Professional Practice of Principal Teachers in a Scottish Secondary School.

Abstract

The globalization of education has in part, been responsible for the application of industrial market mechanisms to Scottish schools. Education is viewed as a "product", with both pupils and parents being regarded as "consumers". Within this market system, teachers are accountable for the quality of the "product", measured by the performance of pupils in external examinations. Performance management practices such as development planning, self evaluation, analysis of examination data, and career review have been introduced into Scottish schools following the introduction of the Standards in Scottish schools Act 2000. Politicians hoped that the introduction of performance management practices would improve the professional performance of teachers, resulting in the improved performance of pupils.

The influence of these market mechanisms and resulting quality assurance systems within Scottish schools is considered at three distinct levels, national, education authority and case study school. This research then attempts to discover how principal teachers, with responsibility for implementing performance management practices within their departments, feel about the effectiveness of these procedures in improving the learning experience of pupils. The interviews take place in May, and again in September of the school academic year 2007. The research also attempts to reveal whether "authentic" learning and teaching practices are being sacrificed for the demands of performance.

A case study approach is pursued within a Scottish secondary school, which involves personal interviews with five principal teachers and the head teacher. The interviews are of sufficient depth to generate a high level of rich data for analysis using a content analysis approach. The minutes of the senior management team meetings from May 2007 -2008 provide a source of secondary data.

The main themes arising from the research results are those of *accountability, performance* and *management.* Each is discussed in turn with the literature, and their impact within the case study school considered.

In conclusion, the effectiveness of market mechanisms within the case study school is considered, leading towards the proposal of a new system of accountability. The results indicated that within the case study school, there was indeed a clear disjunction between "authentic" and "performance" practice amongst principal teachers. The demands of performance practices such as development planning, self evaluation, career review and examination data analysis within a hierarchal management structure was found to have a greater impact on subject principal teachers, than those responsible for pastoral care.

The impact of Curriculum for Excellence on performativity is also considered.

Introduction to Thesis

Rationale

Within education systems throughout the United Kingdom, there is currently an emphasis on school leadership as the key driver to school effectiveness and improvement. There is also an emphasis on management systems such as self evaluation procedures, to quality assure the various aspects of school life. Education management and leadership are regarded by policy makers as a way in which to improve pupil attainment, which is a key indicator of improving schools. Increasing pupil attainment in an equitable way, is regarded as essential within a labour market, where qualifications are a route into higher education and employment. How well pupils aged fifteen in the United Kingdom, are prepared to meet the challenges they may encounter in later life, is compared with pupils at a similar stage in other countries, through the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). Comparative international assessment can extend and enrich the national picture, by providing a broader context within which to interpret national performance. Globally however, there is some concern amongst commentators, that school effectiveness is measured mainly in terms of pupil attainment in examinations.

This model of 'new managerialism' has been adapted from the management structures of industry and the private sector, together with public choice theory, new institutional economics and human capital theory. 'New public management' has

emerged as an amalgamation of these theories, which has been used as a way of legitimising state educational change (Peters, M., 2003).

New managerialism has seen a move away from the control of inputs, to the quantification of outputs and performance targets. Education has become competitive with an emphasis of productive efficiency, where the citizen now becomes the consumer. This 'marketisation' of education has led to the introduction of performance management practices in schools, and it is this which, according to commentators, has the greatest impact on teacher's professional practice. Therefore, for the purposes of this research, performance management will be regarded as the superordinate concept.

Raising attainment may be achieved through school improvement, where it is argued, the quality of teachers and schools is enhanced through the implementation of whole school performance management practices. Current education reform places considerable emphasis on the relationship between both leadership, and school improvement. Effective leaders exercise a powerful influence on the effectiveness of the school and on the achievement of pupils(Harris, A., 2002). Pupil attainment is however, more likely to improve where leadership sources are distributed throughout the school community, empowering teachers to lead. The increasing emphasis on the importance of distributed leadership is however antagonistic to the current hierarchical model of leadership within schools. This in turn has implications for the current systems of quality improvement within schools, which are constructed around the hierarchal model.

External pressures are also needed to drive forward improvement, according to Creemers (2007), and may include;

a) Market mechanisms – where competition between schools leads to parents being able to make informed decisions regarding their child's education.

b) External accountability – when exam results are published by the media in the form of league tables, schools are held accountable.

c) External agents – HMIE Inspectors and policy makers, education authorities.

d) Government policies affecting school improvement – for example the implementation of a Curriculum for Excellence in Scottish schools.

As a principal teacher within a Scottish secondary school, it has become apparent over the last ten years that significantly more time is being spent on satisfying the demands of performativity such as development planning, self-evaluation, analysis of examination data and career reviews. If the performance of teachers is improved through performance management practices such as self-evaluation procedures, the implication is that the performance of pupils will subsequently improve. The purpose of this research is to discover if this is indeed the perception of principal teachers themselves, and what effect performance management practices have on learning and teaching, and on the management of their departments. In particular, this research attempts to identify if there is a disjunction between the 'performance' practice of principal teachers and what might be described as their 'authentic' teaching practice.

Performance practice, for the purposes of the research, is regarded as those activities undertaken by principal teachers in order to fulfil the demands of performance such as development planning, self-evaluation and so on. Authentic practice may be regarded as a teacher's innate sense of "what is right", or a teacher's relationship with both pupils and colleagues, which are not influenced by the demands of performance. For example, adopting learning and teaching approaches which will meet the needs of individual pupils, rather than meeting the goals of performance. Authentic practice

encompasses those aspects of learning which are not easily measured by quantitative means, such as enjoyment, participation and quality of social relationships.

Consideration is also given as to whether market mechanisms within education apply to an isolated, rural Scottish secondary school such as the case study school featured within this research.

Chapter 1 considers the effects of globalization on education in general within the United Kingdom, in particular the influence of the global knowledge economy on education policy. Education reform has focused on outputs and economic productivity resulting in school pupils and parents being regarded as 'customers', and knowledge regarded as a commodity within a competitive market place. Possession of credentials which affirm the possession of knowledge is seen as a positive influence upon life chances, particularly of those from disadvantaged backgrounds who may lack other resources to gain employment or entry to further and higher education. The success of this 'quasi-market' in education depends upon the performance of teachers, and it is implied, the subsequent performance of pupils. The performance of teachers is measured through formal means of accountability using quality assurance procedures such as self-evaluation, career review and development planning. How principal teachers within a Scottish secondary school *feel* about these procedures is investigated through the research question "*What are the perceptions of principal teachers of performance management practices at different times within the school academic year?*"

Performance indicators and targets are used to make comparisons of teachers and schools in terms of productivity and effectiveness. The publication of Standard Tables and Charts (STACS) data reveals the grades attained by pupils in external examination for every subject department in the school, and by association, the

performance or effectiveness of the principal teacher of that subject. League tables of external examination results compare schools with each other according to grades obtained from standard grade to advanced higher by their pupils. This research considers the extent to which performance management practices might affect teacher behaviour through the research question, "*How does performance management impact on the professional practice of principal teachers within learning and teaching, together with the management of a department?*"

Within Chapter 1, the reasons for the increasing accountability of teachers are considered together with the paradigms of bureaucratic and professional accountability. The effects of performativity on teacher professionalism, relationships between people, and the position of principal teachers within the school as an organization are discussed. Specifically the use of the department development plan as a mechanism of control is considered through the research question, "*What impact does development planning as a tool of performance management have on the professional practice of principal teachers?*" Detailed responses to these research questions based on the research data may be found in Chapter 6.

Chapter 2 considers how traditional values within Scottish schools have been replaced with market values, resulting in quality assurance policies that reinforce formal accountability mechanisms. The traditional educational values within a distinctive Scottish system are linked to a sense of national identity, particularly through the establishment of a Scottish Parliament in 1999.

The effects of quality assurance systems and market mechanisms on traditional educational values within the Scottish education system are considered at national,

education authority and school level. The specific effects of these within the situation of the case study school are analysed. This involves a particular consideration of the role of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education (HMIE) within a formal system of accountability. The effectiveness of distributed leadership as a means to drive forward school improvement, and possible barriers to implementation within a formal, hierarchical model of school management are considered.

Evidence from research within Scottish secondary schools is obtained for the adoption of 'performance practice' amongst principal teachers rather than 'authentic practice', in order to make a contribution to the current discourse surrounding performance management in schools.

Chapter 3 describes the research design and methods used in the study. The principal aim of the research is to find evidence of 'performance' and 'authentic' practice amongst principal teachers within the case study school, and whether or not there was a clear disjunction between the two. The interpretive approach has been selected, using a case study research design in order to gauge the feeling of five principal teachers, and the head teacher, towards performance management practices within their school. Information for analysis was generated through the use of semi-structured interviews, which were recorded on a digital voice recorder.

Ethical considerations, which apply throughout the research, include confidentiality, anonymity of participants and school, discretion of the researcher, and involvement of participants in the development of the research. Issues of validity, reliability and generalisability are also discussed in this chapter.

The interview data are analysed using a 'content analysis' approach, where evidence was sought to confirm or refute pre-existing grounded theories about performance and authentic practice. Initial codes for the data were devised, with further codes being

generated as the analysis progressed. It soon became apparent that along with codes for 'authentic' and 'performance' data, a new set of codes were required to accommodate data, which intersected both of these categories. Data within this category is referred to as 'integrated' practice.

A description of the results of research is presented in Chapter 4. The number of responses given by principal teachers and the head teacher within each code, under the headings of 'authentic', 'performance' and 'integrated' practice is presented in the form of a table for each interview question. Following each table, is the percentage frequency of responses for 'authentic', 'performance' and 'integrated' practices. It is assumed that the greater the number of responses for each code, the greater the importance given to the issue by principal teachers and the head teacher. Interview question response data is presented for May and September of the school year, in the form of tables, together with accompanying brief descriptive commentaries.

Secondary data is provided in the form of an analysis of the minutes of weekly senior management team minutes from May 2007 until May 2008 inclusive, together with the self-evaluation forms completed by principal teachers. The main themes arising from these sources for discussion are school and department development planning, quality assurance, operational and administrative issues, discipline, education management and national priorities in education.

The descriptive research data is then discussed under the three emerging themes, which are 'accountability', 'performance' and 'management' in Chapter 5. The hierarchal structure of accountability is examined within the case study school, together with the accountability of principal teachers for learning and teaching. Within the formal structure of accountability, the interrelationship between self-evaluation and autonomy is discussed and their links to quality assurance within the

school. The use of the analysis of Standard Tables and Charts data (STACS) as a possible method of holding principal teachers to account, is also discussed.

The theme of management is discussed through the perspectives of the management of people, change and resources. Career review and monitoring of teachers is also discussed together with the influence of administrative tasks.

It appears that the professional practice of principal teachers within the case study school is indeed affected by performance management practices such as development planning, class observations and career reviews. Evidence from the research data suggested that principal teachers were compliant to the demands of performance, and exhibited contrived collegiality within the school. These findings are illustrated with direct quotes from principal teachers and the head teacher, together with references to the literature on the emerging themes.

Each of the three research questions are addressed and discussed fully in Chapter 6. The first research question is "*What are the perceptions of principal teachers of performance management practices at different times within the school year?*" It has emerged that these perceptions are indeed different in May and September of the school year, possibly due to the exertion of different performance pressures. It is also evident that the perceptions between principal teachers of subjects, and those of pastoral care are significantly different, perhaps because subject principal teachers are being reconstructed as managers of reform.

The second research question is "*How does performance management impact on the professional practice of principal teachers within learning and teaching together with the management of a department?*" Research data indicates that subject principal teachers exhibit 'performance practices' as they perceive accountability for their professional practice to operate through self-evaluation, STACS analysis and their

position within the hierarchal structure of management. Evidence is discussed for the apparent sacrifice of 'authentic practice' in favour of 'performance practice', and the existence of 'integrated practice', which may be classified as 'authentic' or 'performance' practice, particularly amongst subject principal teachers. The performance practice that has this most significant impact on the management of departments is the process of career review of class teachers. Why this should be the case is considered fully within this chapter.

The third research question posed is "*What impact does development planning as a tool of performance management have on the professional practice of principal teachers?*" The findings suggest that departmental development plans within the case study school are not influenced by either the school development plan or the analysis of STACS data. According to the STACS data for the case study school over the last five years, pupil attainment continues to fall and is of significant concern to the education authority. This perhaps draws into question the role of performativity in raising attainment.

The main influences on development planning, appeared to be the needs of the department in terms of resources. This example of fabricated compliance amongst principal teachers is discussed within this chapter.

Final conclusions are presented in Chapter 6, together with consideration of the impact of the implementation of Curriculum for Excellence in Scottish schools in 2010. This seems likely to change the professional roles of teachers, from managers of performance to authentic practitioners, generating the need for new accountability systems.

CHAPTER 1

A Critical Review of Market Mechanisms and Performance Management Practices in Schools Within the United Kingdom

Global education policy at present focuses on how to improve the effectiveness of teachers through performance management, which subsequently impacts on both their role and status within schools (Whitty, 2002). Are teachers to be regarded as professionals, who are trusted to meet the learning needs of individual pupils, or as technicians who simply carry out prescribed tasks? In general, the literature is highly critical of performativity and market mechanisms within education. This chapter considers and identifies the main areas of criticism referred to in the literature.

For the purposes of this research performativity is defined as a particular set of practices implemented by managers, and aimed at influencing the behaviours and outcomes achieved by individuals within organizations (Reeves et.al.2002). Performativity is associated with school improvement through quality assurance systems that monitor performance, and market mechanisms through which parental choice of school is seen as a spur to improvement. Performativity affects the nature of schooling and of teacher professionalism by changing the relationship between teachers, pupils and their parents. Teachers are now regarded as 'producers', pupils and parents as 'consumers'. Teachers are now accountable for the level of attainment achieved by the pupils they teach in external examinations. Parents may choose the school which they believe, provides their child with the best opportunity for achieving

a high level of attainment in external examinations, perhaps based on school performance data.

This chapter provides an overview of these matters, and the main criticisms of market mechanisms in section 1.1, and performance management practices in section 1.2, as presently applied to schools within the United Kingdom. This is followed by an interrogation of the literature on mechanisms of accountability in section 1.3, and teacher professionalism in section 1.4. In conclusion, the influence of the main themes identified within the literature on the methods of data collection and analysis adopted within the research, will be summarized in section 1.5.

1.1 Market Mechanisms in Education

Education in the United Kingdom is currently undergoing significant change, due primarily to the effects of globalisation. According to Stromquist and Monkman (2000;4), globalisation may be regarded as,

"A set of processes by which the world is rapidly being integrated into one economic space via increased international trade, the internationalisation of production and financial markets, together with the internationalisation of a commodity culture, promoted by an increasingly networked global telecommunications system."

Giddens (2000:5) observes that,

"Globalisation is largely the result of political decisions to deregulate markets."

Stromquist and Monkman (2000:12) reflect on the implications of globalisation in Britain when they state,

"In a globalised world, as technology becomes its main motor, knowledge assumes a powerful role in production, making it's possession essential for nations, if they are to successfully pursue economic growth and competitiveness."

Developments of these technologies means that "knowledge" is becoming an increasingly important element in both world trade and in economic power, and that,

"Education appears to be increasingly subject to the normative assumption and prescriptions of "economism" (Lingard et.al. 1998:84).

The implication here seems to be that it is the concept of the global knowledge economy that currently has the most significant influence on education policy in the United Kingdom (Giddens, 2000:86). The position of a country in a competitive, economic environment is dependent on its capacity to develop those highly specialised products that dominate the 'value added' aspects of world trade. Countries can become more competitive through investing in the knowledge base of their manufacturing industry, and the production of highly specialised new technologies. Here, knowledge itself is the trading commodity.

Referring to the knowledge economy, Lyotard (1984:38) observes,

"Knowledge is no longer legitimated through grand narratives of speculation and emancipation, but rather in the pragmatics of optimisation, the creation of skills and profit rather than ideals."

The effects of economic competition mean that governments are under pressure to adapt quickly the content and structures of education, so that they respond better to the changing demand for skilled workforces. Flexibility within an unpredictable environment means that education systems themselves must develop their capacity to

adapt, by becoming more autonomous, competitive and less dependent upon central regulation (Hirtt, 2005).

Although a definitive worker profile for the 'knowledge economy' eludes us, this blurring and conflation of education and economic purposes, is a consequence of government attempting to mediate supranational forces by gearing educational policy towards the preparation of a workforce fit to occupy a 'high tech' niche within the global market. This has had the effect of redefining educational purpose in relation to market prerogatives, rather than individual need or societal improvement. Indeed, current education policy is doing little to alleviate existing inequalities in access and participation, and may in fact be exacerbating them (Ball, 2004:145).

The Social Mobility White Paper released by the British Government on 13th January 2009, focuses on education and skills to enable children from disadvantaged backgrounds to access top professions in an attempt to address social inequality.

Underpinning current New Labour policies, are the beliefs that education enables individuals to obtain employment and stable income sources, in a competitive global market, and that education is crucial to overcoming the low skill equilibrium of the British economy (Kendall and Holloway, 2000:154). Education reform has focused on outputs and economic productivity through "managerialist" control. This has included children now being regarded as "customers", and knowledge viewed as a commodity, which may be exchanged for a place within the job market. Willmott (1995:13) proposes that children within schools themselves, may be regarded as a commodity within the globalised knowledge economy. He suggests that demands of competition, school diversity, league tables and pressures from the state for performance, improvement and target achievement per capita funding, create local economies of 'pupil worth' which favours selection of pupils most likely to contribute

to 'improvements' and 'performance'. The implication here is that the way for head teachers to survive within a performative culture is to be selective regarding pupil intake. This is indeed the case within schools in England and Wales (Whitty, 2002), however selection of pupils based on ability is less evident within Scottish schools, and will be considered in Chapter 2.

This idea of selecting pupils according to their "value" within the knowledge economy, is supported by Kenway and Bullen (2001; 140) who state,

"In this economy, some children are of 'high value', are 'value adding' and much sought after. Others of 'low value' who 'add negative value', are where possible avoided."

They continue,

"The economy of student worth, seeking the 'easy child', and seeking success in a performative culture, is very much a product, albeit a side effect, of current education policy."

One way of raising a school's performance within the league tables, is to focus on those pupils on the 'cusp' between a pass and a fail in external exams. There is evidence of schools targeting these pupils through coaching, and the provision of additional resources (Reeves, J., et. al. 2002).

Another significant consequence of the 'quasi-market' in education, is the transformation of the majority of parents into informed 'customers', who make choices based on ethos, a phenomenon which is difficult to measure, rather than on hard data about the value added to pupils' examination results. The ethos of a school as perceived by parents may consist of the social composition of the school, the relationships between teachers and pupils, and between pupils themselves, the approach to discipline issues, leadership of the head teacher and the role of the school

within the local community. Parents can be influenced by their children's perceptions of learning, and the opinions of other parents, rather than by statistical examination data (Burrell, 1998:313).

The introduction of market mechanisms within education is not simply the adoption of a neutral mechanism; it also involves the socialisation of key actors into a new value system, that is a re-orientation of producers from a service ethic, towards a sense of competitive self-interest (Ball, 1992:14). Market and managerial reforms are ostensibly concerned with increasing efficiency and raising standards. Market and management remove education from the public arena of civil society, from collective responsibility, and effectively privatise it (Ball, 1994:54).

The subsequent effect of the application of private market principles to children within schools across the United Kingdom, is described by Monbiot (2002:6) who states,

"Our schools are being privatised, not for the benefit of our children, but for the benefit of our corporations and the export economy, to which government hopes they will one day contribute. Children are simply the raw materials with which they work. They will, unless parents demand an end to this experiment, be traded on the world's stock markets like so many barrels of oil."

Modernization in the United Kingdom then, within the key policies introduced in 1979 by the Thatcher government and continued by New Labour in 1997, has resulted in the more explicit alignment of education with economic growth, and the creation of wealth. This reform agenda has resulted in the distancing of public sector values of equal opportunity and fairness away from welfare and civic society, towards an

enterprise culture promoting a consumer driven knowledge economy (Gleeson and Husbands 2003).

Market and managerial reform within schools is concerned with increasing efficiency and raising standards, changing professional and managerial cultures away from public policy narratives, to those based on private market principles (Clark and Newman, 1997). Ball (1999) observes that 'accountability" and "competition" are central to the new managerialism, the emerging form of legitimisation in post-industrial societies for both the production of knowledge, and it's transmission through education. Ball (1999:501) continues,

"Technologies through which professionals can be reconstructed as managers of reform are of strategic importance to implementing performance management through self-control."

This process of re-forming meaning and identity amongst managers, teachers and learners reflects forms of quality control rooted in the measured performance of individuals, in terms of their disposition and output (Clark and Newman, 1997).

1.2 Performance Management Practices Within Schools

Within the British education system, politicians view performance management as a mechanism for placing pressure on the education system in order to drive forward continuous improvement, and address the persistent problem of that percentage of the pupil population within secondary schools regarded as underachievers (Reeves, J., et.al. 2002). This refers to that group of pupils who have failed to achieve a benchmark qualification, and are therefore seen as a threat to economic growth. In

general terms, performance management is a means of auditing and managing activities within a complex system such as education.

Performance indicators and targets are the new currencies of judgment in education. They provide an infrastructure of comparisons which value practitioners and institutions solely in terms of their productivity; that is, their performance (Lingard, Ladwig et.al. 1998:18). The constant collection and publication of performance data, embeds intrinsically in everything teachers do. Increasingly, teachers choose to judge their actions in terms of effectiveness and appearance. Beliefs and values are no longer important, it is *output* that counts.

The quest for efficiency in the state school system has been translated into education policy, which appears to be focused on measurable indicators, such as examination results. There exists a belief amongst policymakers, that improved efficiency means improved external results. At national level, education policy has necessitated and directed the development of measuring technologies, and the establishment of agencies for policing these (Ball, 2004:89). "Is education focusing on efficiency and outputs, reflecting the criteria used in the global McDonalds empire?" (Ritzer, 2000:12). He continues that the key signifiers of a McDonaldised system are efficiency, calculability, predictability and control through non-human technology
National education policy has reproduced McDonaldising techniques of control, which has generated and promoted an English school system, whose structure is characterised by centralising mechanisms engaged in script writing, to control the content of teaching professionals work, and selective performance management to ensure that the 'scripts' are efficiently employed (Wilkinson_2004:93). This effect has

been reduced to an extent in Scottish schools compared to those in England and Wales, with the introduction of Curriculum for Excellence in 2010, which gives teachers greater freedom by releasing them form the demands of the 'script' by reducing the content of the curriculum in all subject areas. This will be considered further in Chapter 2.

Ball (2003, 2004) recognises that in McSchools, focus on outputs means beliefs and values take second place, as the pernicious effects of performativity lead to intensification, contradiction, fabrications and alienation. The practice and performance of practitioners are calibrated and judged against a limited range of statistically quantifiable performance indicators. For example, teachers are held accountable for the attainment of their pupils in external examinations. Qualitative measures of pupil self confidence, and ability to work in groups for example, are not taken into account.

The emergent forms of governance in education are also geared towards the delivery of improved student outcomes (effectiveness), at the most efficient cost. Restructured educational systems demand proof of outcomes as a form of accountability. The centralised demand for student outcomes accountability data is the other side of the decentralising thrust of the new "steering at a distance" approach within educational systems (Lingard, Hayes and Mills, 2000:24). This approach means that it is possible for the state to blame schools for faults or difficulties inherent in, or created by policies. The state has power without responsibility.

The main purposes of self-evaluation of teachers as a mechanism of accountability, and other forms of audit, are ostensibly to empower teachers and improve the learning experience of pupils. Is this the real reason, or is performance management in all of its

forms simply a government device to ensure the improved performance of teachers? Shore and Wright (2000:58) observe that this form of audit,

"Rests upon the simultaneous imposition of external control from above, and the internalisation of new norms so that individuals can continuously improve themselves."

They go on to state that the teaching professional is simply,

"A de-personalised unit of economic resource, whose productivity and performance must be constantly measured and enhanced."

Perhaps then, performance management practices affect a teacher's professional behaviours. According to Fitz-Gibbon (1996), teachers perform in strategic ways as a consequence of performance management practices. When using self-evaluation procedures, there is an innate need to be seen in the best possible light by colleagues and line managers. Fitz-Gibbon goes on to highlight the corrupting effects of quality indicators, and provides examples of how they can tempt people to distort them, or adopt behaviours that may be contrary to the desired impact of improved quality. Smith (1995:277) has also documented how the use of quality indicators can result in dysfunctional behaviour amongst teachers.

1.3 Mechanisms of Accountability

The need for greater accountability of teachers gained credence in the United Kingdom following Labour Prime Minister James Callaghan's Ruskin speech in 1976, in which he said that all teachers had a responsibility to explain and justify their decisions to a wider audience, including parents, education authorities and the government. In the context of rising oil prices and the prospect of economic recession,

value for money within education was even more crucial. Greater accountability was seen by politicians as a means of ensuring value for money.

According to Bush and West Burnham (1994), there are two paradigms of accountability, namely *bureaucratic* and *professional*. Bureaucratic accountability involves the annual audit of departmental targets and outcomes, and the process of career review through a hierarchal system of accountability. Professional accountability is the development of "professional knowledge", which according to Schon (1991:21), may be regarded as the ability to solve problems by the application of scientific theory and techniques. Professional accountability then, may be regarded as the development of "professional knowledge" through instructions, interactions, and ethical practice. This definition of professional accountability is supported by Cohen and Ball (1999:43) who propose that the focus of accountability is three fold. The first focus of accountability is the process of instruction, including the interaction of teachers, pupils and their performance. The second focus is the acquisition and application of the knowledge, and skills needed for effective practice. The third and final focus is professional interchange, putting pupils first, together with professional collaboration to ensure both improvement in learning, and high standards of professional practice.

Although a combination of bureaucratic and professional accountability may be the most useful structure to ensure long-term school improvement, professional accountability has more potential for expanding incentives for improvement, with an emphasis on "motivators" such as commitment to pupils, and being identified within the local community as a teacher (O'Day, 1996:16). My own view is, that unless teachers are motivated within a system of accountability which resonates with their

own professional priorities, they will exhibit fabricated compliance, finding ways around the system and even generating false evidence of performance.

Teachers within schools are accountable for the performance of their pupils in external examinations. What are the incentives for teachers to maintain a personal commitment to the continued improvement of examination results? Scott (1998) suggests three possible incentives. The first is money and promotion. The second is the "intrinsic need" for professional position, and a reputation for consistently generating good results within the community. The third incentive is "purposive", gaining personal satisfaction in achieving targets set for pupils, and seeing them do well.

Finnigan and Gross (2001:10) observe

"School accountability policies fail to tap into intrinsic purposive incentives, focusing instead on the threat of material sanctions such as re-assignment, job loss or rewards."

The effectiveness of professional accountability in driving school improvement may be affected by the existing model of school management, together with the effectiveness of performance management practices. The latter may be affected by an increasing emphasis on the importance of distributed leadership within schools, where the head teachers directs the empowerment of teachers to lead. The formal hierarchical model of management within schools however, is a barrier to the development of distributed leadership, as it resists teachers achieving greater autonomy and taking on leadership roles within the school (Harris, A., and Lambert, L., 2002). With leadership however comes responsibility, and subsequently perhaps even greater demands of accountability for teachers. Accountability for performance is currently applied through performance management mechanisms which are

implemented through a hierarchical structure of management. If distributed leadership is seen as the way forward in improving school effectiveness, then it would seem, the norms of performance management practices will have to be reconstructed.

1.4 Performativity and Teacher Professionalism

The technologies, through which professionals can be reconstructed as managers of reform, are of strategic importance in the implementation of performance management through "self-control". It appears that functionalist education policy and management theory, have anticipated and accommodated the deculturing of agency and identity as the key drivers of a 'network' or 'knowledge' society (Castells, 1996), which has been achieved by co-opting self-assessment, inspection and peer review into the performance management process (DuGay,1996). Such policy drivers are highly routinised and associated with enhanced powers of control and surveillance, to ensure increased compliance and productivity, in response to targets set by government (Clark and Newman, 1997).

Lyotard (1984:19) observes,

"Performativity consists of the terms 'soft' and 'hard' in relation to performance and efficiency. We must be 'operational' or disappear."

These effects of performativity on teacher professionalism, are clarified by Ball (2005:20), who states,

"Commitment and experience within practice have to be sacrificed or compromised for impression and performance."

This implies a potential "splitting" between a teacher's own professional judgement about good practice, and pupil needs on one hand, and the rigours of performance on the other.

This research attempted to explore the existence of, what is referred to by McNess, Broadfoot and Osborne (2003:243) as,

"A disjunction between policy and preferred practice."

A teacher's 'authentic' practice may be described as a "teacher's sense of what is right", or a teacher's relationship with pupils and colleagues. However, the influence of performance management practice may mean that commitment to learning is replaced by superficial goals of performance, and knowing the world as something we have produced, is replaced by compliance and silence (Ball, 2005:20). The model of organisational management within a school significantly affects teacher authenticity. Education management is concerned with relationships between people, within an organisation. Performance management practices have resulted in new kinds of social relations within education and learning which are now being enacted.

Education reform requires a new kind of teacher with new kinds of knowledge. One who can maximise performance, set aside irrelevant principles and outmoded social commitments, for whom excellence and improvement are the driving force of their practice. New professionalism within a performative society, may be described as,

"A willingness and ability to adapt to the necessities and vicissitudes of policy." Ball, (2005:22).

This change in the social relationships between people within a school as an organisation, is recognised by Bernstein (1996:88) who states,

"There is a crisis, and what is at stake is the very concept of education itself."

Educational reform has not simply meant a technical change in the management of the delivery of educational services, but has involved changes in what it *means* to be both a teacher and a learner. However, according to Newman et.al. (1996:280),

"Reform efforts may increase active learning without enhancing the intellectual quality of student's work."

Power et.al. (1997) raise serious questions about the unintended consequences of "new managerialism", upon the managerial performance of head teachers. In particular, they report an increase in the professional and social distance within schools between those who manage, and those who teach. This reinforces the concerns of Bernstein (1996:88), who refers to a crisis in education. This 'crisis' may refer to the distancing between head teachers and senior managers on one hand, and teacher on the other.

Government attention is now switching to the 'internal relationships' between head teachers and classroom teachers. Emotions within management are now receiving a higher profile (Hatcher, 1994:41). This trend is echoed by Burrell (1998:313) who states,

"Emotions and passions have to be rationalised within organisational life, and the pre-modern is of particular relevance today in our emotion suppressed organisation."

He continues,

"Our relationship to our jobs, to ourselves and to each other is becoming more attenuated. Script and smile vary little, therefore often seem contrived."

This is what Ritzer (1993) refers to as "false fraternisation". Front line workers must instrumentalise their affects for profit or pay, while appearing to be genuine in their quest to elicit "customer delight" (Burrell, 1998:313). According to Le Grand (1997:153),

"Assumptions concerning human motivation and behaviour are the key to the design of social policy. Policy makers fashion policy on the assumption that those affected by the policies, will behave in certain ways, and will do so because they have certain motivations. Assumptions determine the way that welfare institutions are constructed, depending on whether people are assumed to be "knights", "knaves" or "pawns". Knights are public spirited and unselfish. Knaves are motivated by self interest, and pawns are passive and unresponsive."

Hume (1975:117) proposed that policies designed on the assumption that people are "knights" are likely to have disastrous consequences if in fact; they are predominantly "knaves". Titmus (1971:243) suggests that the same is true for policies fashioned on the basis of a belief that people are "knaves", if the consequence is to suppress their naturally altruistic impulses. He states,

"If it is accepted that Man has a sociological and biological need to help, then to deny him opportunities to express that need, is to deny him the freedom to enter into gift relationships."

Le Grand (1997:159) proposes,

"The "knavish" strategy implicit in the quasi-market agenda, is not simply a coercive mechanism to repress knavery, rather it is an attempt to harness the self interest of those working within the system to the public good."

It seems that this may well be the case within schools, where accountability mechanisms steer teachers towards competition and political gain, through focusing primarily on external examination outcomes. Teachers have become then objects of management, relegated to the status of human resources, who do not participate, or are included in partnership. They appear to be there to be "managed". According to Ball (1994:62),

"As the focus of appraisal, accountability, comparison and review, the teacher is very visible; as an expert professional actor and decision maker, she is all but invisible."

Ball continues,

"The school development plan signifies and celebrates the exclusion and subjection of the teacher, who loses control over classroom planning decisions, and is monitored, judged and compared by criteria set elsewhere. It is a device for achieving change, and asserting control."

Management is both a means and an end within the process of education reform, as it embraces both enterprise and commercialism, shifting schools away from the "culture of welfare" towards a culture of "profit and production". Self-management, intrinsic to the process of performance management in schools, is a mechanism for the delivery of reform, rather than a vehicle for institutional initiative and innovation (Ball, 1994:78).

"Teacher's careers, organisational micro politics, state power and policies, are intertwined in a complex process of change in patterns of control, relationships and values in schools. The meaning of "the teacher" and the nature of teaching as a career are at stake, as is in general terms, the future of education as a public service" (Ball, 1994:64).

The perceived effects of education reform on teacher professionalism are described by Jeffrey and Woods (1996), as "professional uncertainty" which can, they argue, be induced when external constraints, such as performance management practices, run counter to the 'holistic and humanistic' values of teachers. The cumulative effect of this is described in stronger terms by Helsby (1999), who observes that as a result of marketisation and managerialism, teacher professionalism is being "systematically dismantled". An increase in teacher accountability, assessment, administration and general workload, means that there is less opportunity for creative work, and building relationships with pupils. However, recent education policy within the United Kingdom recognises this, and the intention is to provide greater opportunities in the future for teachers to be able to use their professional judgement. This will allow teachers to have greater choice in what is taught, teaching approaches and methods of assessment within a less prescriptive framework.

Research carried out by McNess et.al. (2003), amongst primary teachers in England, suggested that priorities imposed from outside, resulted in a loss of personal fulfilment and autonomy, although personal moral responsibility was still important. According to McNess et.al. (2003:244) there was,

"A shift of climate, from a covenant based on trust, to a contract based on delivery of education to meet external requirements, and national economic goals."

The "Encompass Project", (Bristol Graduate School of Education, in McNess et.al. (2003:255), attempted to understand the influence of national context and national policy, within the work of classroom teachers, and the school experience of pupils in England, France and Denmark. Research evidence showed that teachers in England, in contrast to colleagues in France, and Denmark, projected a clear disjunction between 'policy' and 'preferred practice', and have become subject to a growing

"performance" model of practice governing not only "inputs and processes", but also "outputs" of education.

This research attempts to provide some evidence to indicate whether this might also be the case in Scotland amongst principal teachers within a secondary school.

According to Ozga and Lawn (1988:324),

"There are problems for management in manipulating professionalism as a form of control."

One such problem may be to affect teacher's emotional labour, and their subsequent performance in the classroom, known as "internal marketing". If teachers are treated bureaucratically, then they may approach learning and teaching in the same way (Varey, 1995).

The workplace is now seen not just as a bureaucratic structure, but also as a "lived culture"; a shared and socially constructed symbolic universe, in which one's identity can be recognised and rewarded (Du Gay, 1996:316). Head teachers should therefore, manage *emotionally* as well as *rationally* (Fullan, 1998), thereby revealing emotional intelligence (Cooper and Sawaf, 1997). The emotional manager attends not only to the manipulation of organisational structures, but also to social processes and the recognition of individual identities. This is "reculturing" as opposed to "restructuring" (Hargreaves, 1997).

Proponents of internal marketing recognise that emotions now have their place within an organisation, and that in order to be effective, school managers must be affectively orientated towards these changes. They must "perform" (stage manage) their emotions, which gives the notion of performativity a new "twist". There is within

organisations, the possibility of "contrived emotionality", which may be described as a "disenchantment" with "re-enchantment" (Du Gay, 1996:319).

It would seem therefore, that the continuing re-structuring of education has perhaps significant consequences for the professionalism of teachers. It may be that reforms in the United Kingdom during the 1980's have changed the professional role of teachers from that of "manager of learning opportunities' and "assessor of learning outcomes," to a "deliverer of the curriculum, and assessment procedures" (Huson, 1979). This view is to some extent supported by Ball (1990) who suggests that teachers as professionals have become de-skilled as organisers of the learning process, and re-constructed as administrators and managers, compelled to believe that commitment to self-evaluation, peer observation, career review and development planning, will somehow achieve a higher level of professionalism or "new professionalism". Increasing teacher responsibility through distributed leadership may perhaps mean less accountability through a 'flatter' hierarchical structure, but greater accountability through the internalised norms of performance management practices.

1.5 Summary

This chapter has attempted to provide a critical overview of the theme of performance management in education within the United Kingdom, through the four perspectives of market mechanisms, performance management practices, mechanisms of accountability and teacher professionalism.

While considering market mechanisms in education, the concept of globalisation and the knowledge economy where knowledge is regarded as a commodity was

addressed, together with the resulting need for formal mechanisms of accountability. These mechanisms included development planning, self evaluation and career review. The measurement of outputs within a knowledge economy through performance management practices were then discussed, and their resulting effects on the professionalism of teachers considered. The key issues identified were the changing role of teachers and the increasing need to be accountable for their professional performance. Consideration was given to the increasing emphasis on distributed leadership in enhancing school improvement, and the subsequent consequences for the norms of performance management.

An interrogation of the literature was then undertaken to find out about specific mechanisms of accountability, and their subsequent effects on the professional practice of teachers.

The literature reviewed within this chapter focused on education within the United Kingdom and provided a base from which it was possible to construct a theoretical understanding of the effects of performance management practices, through an understanding of the effects of globalisation, marketisation, and systems of accountability on principal teachers within a Scottish secondary school.

Chapter 2

The Influence of Market Mechanisms and Quality Assurance Systems Within Scottish Education.

Knowledge, as a commodity may now be freely traded around the world instantaneously through the world wide web, irrespective of national boundaries. Although this globalization of the knowledge economy influences education policy, the effect is counteracted to some extent by cultural influences. Hartley (2004:283) observes,

"Whilst the globalization of markets proceeds unchecked, there is a tendency for cultural forms to assert themselves around the banner of national identity."

This chapter examines the culture and traditions of the Scottish education system, and the ways in which the need to improve the performance of teachers within a competitive global market, are expressed through market mechanisms and quality assurance systems.

In section 2.1, the "marketisation" of education is examined, followed by an appreciation of the distinctiveness of Scottish education, and its influence on national identity in section 2.2. The effects of market mechanisms on Scottish education such as parental choice and league tables, is discussed together with the effects of quality assurance systems such as the role of HMIE and self-evaluation procedures. These aspects of market mechanisms and quality assurance procedures are presented within the framework of Scottish education in section 2.3, at national level in section 2.3.1, at education authority level in section 2.3.2 and finally at the level of the case study

school in section 2.3.3. The subsequent implications for this research are discussed in section 2.4, which is followed finally by a summary of this chapter in section 2.5.

2.1 The "Marketisation" of Education

Many commentators argue that the "marketisation" of education within schools has generally, replaced the traditional values of community, co-operation, individual need and equal worth, with market values such as individualism, competition, performativity and differentiation (Ball, 1994:146). There are however exceptions to this observation, at national and local levels, and within individual schools. For example, North Lanarkshire Education Authority has adopted a co-operative approach to learning involving the local community. It is important to note however, that these exceptions are very much in the minority.

These market place values are reinforced by policy makers through control of the curriculum and assessment procedures, where schools compete against each other in terms of offering broadly the same curriculum, within one national examination system. The Government, it may be argued, retains overall control regarding the access to the acquisition of intellectual capital, and what it perceives as worthwhile 'knowledge', through both the school curriculum and national assessment procedures. The performance of individuals is measured through increasingly complex accountability systems, in order that politicians may be assured of value for money in terms of worthwhile knowledge being delivered through the school system. However, a large number of pupils are failing to achieve this 'worthwhile knowledge', which poses a threat to economic competitiveness, as mentioned in Chapter 1.

Market mechanisms were introduced as a vehicle for school improvement in a system that was seen as being in the control of producers as in the rest of the United

Kingdom, that is teachers and other education professionals, and not responsive enough to the needs of consumers, namely parents, pupils, industry and the commercial sector. This aimed to provide more choice for both pupils and parents. Competition between schools was encouraged, where academic achievements were displayed in the form of published exam results, in an attempt to attract "customers". Competition between schools took place through the provision of the same curriculum, where the incentive was a proportional increase in resources, according to the rise in pupil numbers. Pressure was put upon schools whose roll was in decline, to improve their market image or face the prospect of closure.

The Conservative Government of the 1980's in a move towards reducing the role of education authorities, gave schools the chance to "opt out" following a parental ballot, and manage themselves with direct funding from the government. However, few schools in Scotland chose this option, and remained under the control of the education authority. Local Management of Schools (LMS) however, gave schools control over their own budgets and day to day management. As funds were determined by the number and age of pupils attending a school, state schools then set out to attract as many pupils, or 'customers' as possible, contributing to the formation of a 'quasi-market' in education. Although market mechanisms applied in Scotland, they operated in a context which continued to see schools as a collective resource for the local community, rather than individual businesses, as evidenced by the lack of interest in opting out (Bryce, T., and Humes, W., 2003).

In 1997 when the Labour Government came into power, it continued in the pursuit of market mechanisms as a way of forcing improvements. Economic rationalism appeared to be the driving force behind Labour's reform of teaching in Scotland.

The introduction of a market mechanism, and subsequent performance management practices, into education had a direct effect on relationships within schools. The hierarchical system of school management was reinforced, with teachers at all levels being accountable to a line manager for their performance. Although there is currently more emphasis being placed upon the importance of distributed leadership, the hierarchical model of management is still prevalent within the majority of Scottish schools at present (Christie, D., and Kirkwood, M., 2006). It may be argued perhaps, that distributed leadership is a mechanism for encouraging teachers to 'normalise' performativity, under the guise of devolved responsibility for improvement.

The relationship between teachers and pupils also changed, with greater emphasis being put on attainment and the achievement of results, rather than the quality of the individual learning experience (Ball, 2005).

The curriculum within Scottish schools prior to Curriculum for Excellence, was not statutory, but perhaps appeared prescriptive to teachers, as a result of the implementation of quality assurance systems within education. Local authorities and schools were expected to follow guidelines, which were determined nationally. The secondary curriculum was dominated by a national examination syllabus, which together with the publication of unofficial league tables in the press, limited scope for flexibility. The percentage of pupils gaining grades A – C in five subjects at higher level in S5, was used as a key indicator of pupil performance.

The curriculum in primary schools through to S2, was governed by the learning outcomes specified within the 5-14 arrangements document, and measured pupil performance in terms of levels A – F. This was centrally controlled through quality assurance practices at both local and national levels.

In both primary and secondary schools, quality assurance arrangements at local authority and national level, meant that the whole system was controlled centrally.

Many commentators would argue that Curriculum for Excellence in Scotland, is an attempt to give teachers more autonomy and emphasise the purposes of education beyond cognitive learning outcomes, to encompass more subjective areas represented by the four capacities, which are more difficult to measure.

Curriculum for Excellence might be regarded as a mechanism by which the Scottish Government has less control over teacher's pedagogical practice, allowing greater flexibility in what is being taught from the age of 3 – 18. Quality assurance practices may however, have a significant role as a mechanism of teacher accountability for the delivery of the new curriculum. This thesis looks for evidence of the effects of quality assurance practices specifically on the professional practice of principal teachers in a Scottish secondary school.

2.2 The Distinctiveness of Scottish Education and Influence on National Identity.

The social and cultural life of Scotland is distinct from that of England due to the focus on three main institutions. These are education, the law and the Church.

Scottish education has been a significant element of national identity since 1707, being perceived as superior to the English system due to the systematic development of literacy throughout the nation, together with the construction of a university system (McPherson and Raab, 1988).

The Scottish myth which prevails is "the lad o'pairts' which referred to a crofter's son who had ability, but lacked the means to benefit fully from schooling. If the school

could provide funds, he could progress to university and become a teacher or minister. Myths such as this, act as general guides which help to interpret complex social reality. They operate as reservoirs of beliefs and values, which allow individuals to interpret the world and their place within it.

The prevailing myth is, that the great strength of the Scottish education system was that it was meritocratic, any young person had the opportunity to progress through the education system and enter a profession such as medicine, teaching or the ministry (Anderson, 2003:219). However, this myth has been heavily contested, partly because the progression through the education system was not open to girls, and wealth bought advantage. The existence of the myth of the "lad o'pairts" today, is due in part to education policy makers carrying forward the myth of equal opportunity. According to McPherson and Raab (1988), Scottish policy makers today give the myth voice through the education system, reinforcing the notion that Scottish education is still strongly linked to Scottish identity. They suggest that many education policy makers, HMIE, and other special interest groups may themselves have come from poor socio-economic backgrounds, and have benefited personally from the Scottish education system, thus perpetuating the myth.

These educational values today are central to the sense of Scottish culture. Belief in the worth and purpose of Scottish education is linked to the sense of national identity, which is regularly invoked to draw attention to the differences between Scottish and English society (Bryce and Humes, 2003).

The Education (Scotland) Act 1872, resulted in the increase of power within education of the state, and cultural uniformity. Common standards were established, filling the educational gaps which the voluntary parish school system could not. Mixed secondary education became established outside main cities, providing a wider

range of parental choice between state schools in the nineteenth century, although schooling did not become compulsory until the twentieth century.

Scotland had, and continues to have, a tradition of national education with religious, political and social roots where educational achievement is highly valued, compared perhaps to some other countries. The myth was, that this system promoted meritocracy, and allowed individuals to move upwards through the system, although the education offered to the ordinary, less academic child was perhaps not as impressive.

According to Anderson (1997:2),

"Education has become a marker of Scottish identity, associated with various supposed qualities of the Scottish character such as individualism, social ambition, respect for talent above birth, or 'metaphysical rationalism'."

From 1918 onwards, pupils were selected by means of an examination, to attend either a junior secondary school which had a vocational focus, or a senior secondary schools which was more academic. Arguments against this selection process stated that senior schools were well resourced at the expense of junior secondary schools, and that working class pupils had a disadvantage in examinations, possibly due to a lack of support at home.

Pressure grew for a comprehensive system of schooling, which saw the abolition of selection of pupils, and was implemented in 1965. The 'O' Grade exam became increasingly unsuitable for the wider population remaining at school until the age of sixteen, following the raising of the school leaving age in 1970. This, together with the abolition of selection, led to the development of a new secondary curriculum in Scotland.

The Munn report in the 1970's addressed the S3 – S4 curriculum, and supported the existence of distinct subjects within the curriculum. Academic provision within the comprehensive system was made through the existence of subject departments, which allowed all pupils to access a common curriculum and assessment procedures, providing equal opportunity for all. During the 1980's, the Dunning Report (1977) recommendations resulted in assessment and certification strategies, based on pre-determined learning outcomes, being introduced into schools. The introduction of success criteria and grades into the assessment system, allowed all pupils to achieve a recognised personal level of success. The grades achieved by individuals were significant, with higher grades providing a gateway to more advanced work, and greater chances of success within employment.

Although Scottish education could be viewed as distinct from that of the rest of Britain, it was still subject to the same pressures for improvement. Distributed leadership within schools could be seen as one mechanism used to 'normalise' performativity amongst teachers under the guise of devolving responsibility for improvement.

Specific improvement mechanisms introduced by the Conservatives, continued under Labour and the devolved Scottish executive. The Conservative Government tried to introduce a system of national testing into Scotland as well as England in 1980, as a way of providing information on school performance to parents, enabling choice. Although this was resisted in primary schools, Scottish Qualifications Authority data on national qualifications, provided evidence for the comparison of secondary schools.

Central control of both the curriculum and assessment, was accompanied by changes in school governance, led by Ministers in a Conservative administration from 1979 to 1997. These changes challenged the Scottish myth of education as a public good, and were resisted by teachers and parents.

Policy tensions arose when the Conservative Government was in power, from 1979 – 1997. The policy of mainstreaming in schools to achieve social unity was counteracted by the parental choice legislation of the 1980's. This influenced the intake of individual schools, through perception of the curriculum which was offered, and the level of pupil discipline. This was prompted by national testing in primary schools, and a fear of the return of selection policies which were antithetical to the myth of Scottish education. These policies were put forward by the radical right wing minister for education Michael Forsyth, which added to the growing demands for political devolution in Scotland.

The Education (Scotland) Act 1981 strengthened the right of parents to have a choice regarding the schooling of their children. Parents were to be afforded more power through membership of school boards, according to legislation passed in 1988. They could choose to "opt out" of local authority control, and manage schools directly through the School Board. However, few school boards took the decision to "opt out", and commentators suggested that they were influenced and controlled by head teachers, rather than by the needs of parents and pupils (Bryce, T., and Humes, W., 2003).

The establishment of a Scottish Parliament in 1999, reinforced a sense of national identity through education, where the First Minister took ultimate responsibility for the education system in Scotland. In 2002, the First Minister promoted a vision of

secondary schooling in Scotland where "every school was excellent". This followed the abolition of university tuition fees in 2000, and the creation of post graduate endowments. Both served to reinforce the distinctiveness of Scottish education compared to that of England, by removing financial barriers to education and providing equal opportunity for all regardless of means.

The Standards in Scottish Schools Act 2000, was one of the first Acts passed by the Scottish Parliament. This set out a new statutory framework for improvement in schools, focusing on inclusion, citizenship, achievement and attainment. Other examples of the distinctiveness of Scottish education is the single examination structure in the form of the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA), together with Learning and Teaching Scotland (LTS). The core remit of LTS is to review the 3-18 curriculum, and provide advice, support and quality assured resources on the curriculum, and assessment procedures to Ministers and the Scottish education system. LTS also works closely with the SQA, to provide quality assured resources in order to support assessment in schools. The implementation of the Scottish education intranet 'Glow', the LTS online service, local authority service 'Interconnect', and effective use of ICT in schools is also the responsibility of LTS. Advice and support is provided to Ministers and schools on the use of ICT to support education, to establish and maintain technology standards for education, and to ensure practitioners have free online access to advice and support, including digital resources.

The provision and delivery of education across Scotland is currently the responsibility of thirty two education authorities. They are accountable to the Scottish Government through a legislative framework, for the implementation of the national priorities in schools, through the production of school development plans. Accountability for

improvements within the overall service provision, including education, is though the submission of a Service Improvement Plan to the Scottish Government. The thirty two education authorities, according to the 2007 HMIE Census, are responsible for 378 secondary schools, and 309,560 pupils. The number of secondary school teachers at this time was recorded as 26,365, producing a pupil / teacher ratio of 11:7 (HMIE, 2008).

The establishment of a Scottish Parliament has given political voice to both social and political values, translating them into institutional practice, which is today more directly politically accountable in the light of perceived electoral pressures. The extent to which the cultural educational values of opportunity for all pupils, and parental choice are actually achieved in practice, together with political accountability, is a matter for analysis and interpretation, and has implications for the way in which performance management is perceived in Scottish schools. If the educational opportunity for all pupils is not equitable, and parental choice is limited, then the value of performance management within schools may be questionable.

The Standards in Scottish Schools Act 2000, set out an improvement framework which operates at three levels, national government, local government and individual schools. At each level a plan is produced to ensure that education ministers, local authorities and schools are accountable for their efforts in seeking improvement of standards in education (Jeyes, 2003). The following section will consider the effects of quality assurance systems and market mechanisms at each of these three levels.

2.3 The Effects of Quality Assurance Systems and Market Mechanisms on Scottish Education.

2.3.1 National Level

In 1840, the state intervened in the quality assurance of schools through the appointment of the first Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools (HMI). This was primarily to ensure accountability for public funding. For 160 years, a balance has been sought between 'control' and 'assistance'. There has historically been a tension between the state and HMI on one hand, and teachers and HMI on the other (Weir, 2003:151).

In Scotland today, Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education (HMIE) must have previously had significant and successful practice as a teacher. The main part of their remit is to inspect all educational institutions in receipt of state funding. These include pre-school centres, primary and secondary schools, special schools, community learning, residential provision, initial teacher education, further education establishments, and education authorities. HMIE are perceived to a large extent within these organizations as agents of the state, rather than the allies of teachers.

Until 1996, and the formation of the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA), HMIE had direct involvement with secondary school assessment, particularly the development of the Standard Grade, National Qualifications and 5-14 programmes. In the 1980's, HMIE took control over 5-14 and the Higher Still initiatives, the latter involving the introduction of a new curriculum into Scottish schools for S5 and S6

pupils. As the influence of the curriculum tends to work downwards, this also resulted in change within the S3 and S4 curriculum.

Since 2001, HMIE has operated at arms length from the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) in the form of an executive agency, with direct accountability to Scottish ministers for their work (Weir, 2003).

HMIE strives to ensure that the 'quality of learning and teaching' becomes a predominant feature of planning within Scottish schools, reducing the tension between inspectors and teachers, as they have a shared vision of providing the best learning experience they can for all pupils.

Schools are expected to build their own internal quality processes around the guidelines provided by HMIE, and look on the inspection process as verification that the school is providing a high quality of education. HMIE now undertake 'light touch' inspections, where support is given to schools regarding self evaluation procedures, rather than detailed inspections of subject departments. Education authorities are no longer inspected, but supported in carrying out their own self validation procedures.

HMIE describe their role in the following terms;

"HMIE are maintaining their rigorous annual programme of independent inspections and reviews. This evidence will enable us to provide independent, professional advice to Scottish Ministers and relevant departments of the Scottish Executive, to inform educational developments and assist in policy formulation." (www.scotland.gov.uk. 2010)

Schools are currently involved in this process through self-evaluation procedures, using the HMIE document HGIOS 3, "How Good Is Our School? The Journey to Excellence Part 3" (HMIE 2007). This is part of the Quality Initiative in Scottish Schools, which promotes self evaluation using HGIOS 3 though all thirty two

education authorities. HMIE advises all schools on the production of a Standards and Quality Report, which documents progress towards meeting attainment, and other agreed targets.

Within HGIOS 3, self-evaluation is presented as a reflective, professional process which promotes innovation through a knowledge of how processes are working. The framework of quality indicators (QI's) act as a guide, and are intended for use with other sources of evidence. The document suggests that self-evaluation by teachers will bring about actions which benefit learning and teaching, by posing the questions;

1. How are we doing?
2. How do we know?
3. What are we going to do now?

The need for peer observation and evaluation by teachers as part of the self-evaluation process, is highlighted as symbolizing professional responsibility of teams of teachers for their work. The framework of quality indicators are arranged under six key questions, and may be found in Appendix 4.

HMIE intend that every year, school managers will lead colleagues in the examination of some aspects of the school's outcomes and impacts. From this analysis, issues intended for further exploration, observation and analysis can be identified. The use of quality indicators together with other sources of evidence such as pupil assessment data, should provide a holistic view of quality within a school at all levels. The same quality indicators are used by HMIE when inspecting schools in Scotland.

The use of HGIOS 3 requires schools within Scotland to critically examine themselves, and assign a level with reference to the key themes within the document of performance outcomes, impact on learners, impact on staff, impact on the

community, delivery of education, policy development and planning, management and support of staff, partnerships and resources, and finally leadership.

A school's own self-evaluation then becomes a key document when HMIE conducts a standards and quality inspection, testing it's observation and analysis against the school's own findings.

The most important measure of performance within Scottish schools, is perceived to be pupil attainment, as it is easily quantifiable and therefore is given most publicity. Performance in SQA examinations from S4 to S6 for Standard Grade and National Qualification courses, are collated in the form of Standard Tables and Charts (STACS data). This form of external examination data records the performance of all S4 to S6 pupils in each school within Scotland, providing average performance data for each education authority, together with a national average benchmark. The national data is analysed by the media, to produce a league table of Scottish schools based on their performance in SQA exams. The league tables, although not officially verified, may subsequently influence parental choice when selecting a school for their children. School league tables are not published by the Government, but constructed by the newspapers from information available. Policy makers may informally use this information, as an indication of the return on their investment within individual schools.

Since 2004, HMIE together with LTS , SEED, and SQA, have worked closely with Education Authorities and schools to promote engagement about the values, purposes and principles of the Curriculum for Excellence. The current focus of education in Scotland is moving now towards outcomes, rather than operational detail, and a commitment to 'intelligent accountability'.

2.3.2 Education Authority Level

The Education Scotland Act 1980 states,

- The right of pupils to be educated as far as is reasonable in accordance with the wishes of their parents.
- The duty of parents to provide efficient education by ensuring their children regularly attend school, or by other means.
- The duty of education authorities to secure adequate and efficient provision of school education.

Education authorities are not currently inspected by HMIE, but undergo a process of Voluntary Self Evaluation, in partnership with HMIE. This process aims to support and challenge the work of education of education authorities, in order to improve the quality of provision and outcomes for learners.

The requirements of the 1980 Act, will be met, from 2010 through the implementation of Curriculum for Excellence in schools.

Each education authority has a legal obligation to ensure the implementation of the four capacities of Curriculum for Excellence in all schools. These are,

1. Successful learners
2. Confident individuals
3. Effective contributors
4. Responsible citizens

How the education authority intend to approach this, and who assumes responsibility for each area is presented within the "service improvement plan". Areas for improvement highlighted by HMIE also appear within this document. A standards

and quality report is also produced highlighting progress with the implementation of improvements. Performance league tables are produced for all local authorities, which the media use to report on the grading of education provision, from 'unsatisfactory' to 'excellent'.

The education authority of the case study school, has appointed two quality improvement officers, who work with the head teachers of both primary and secondary schools to ensure effective quality assurance procedures are in place, such as a time table for self-evaluation procedures, and analysis of school STACS data. They also ensure that the head teacher is taking appropriate steps to implement the education authority priorities within the school.

The school development plans constructed by head teachers are complementary to the authority service improvement plan, in that they must take into account the improvement objectives of the education authority. Head teachers are directly accountable for the work in their schools to the director of education. The school development plan is influenced by individual departmental development plans, and consultations with the school board and pupil groups.

The school development plan is discussed between head teachers and the quality improvement officers. Copies of departmental development plans are submitted to the education authority following discussion with the faculty head.

The education authority also requires principal teachers to complete an analysis of the STACS data relevant to their department, for each level of examination course. This involves a basic analysis of recording a plus sign for overall improvement, a minus sign for a drop in attainment, and an equal sign for no change.

Market mechanisms which began to arise in education in the 1980's influence education authorities today. Pupils are regarded as 'raw materials', schools as 'producers' and examination results as the 'product'. The 'market place' may be symbolized as league tables of both schools and education authorities, with the 'customers' being identified as parents and pupils. The market is however, too tightly regulated for it to be considered 'free', and may be regarded as a 'quasi-market'. Outputs such as national curriculum guidelines, national testing and inspections are controlled by the Scottish Government.

Market mechanisms in education have however, resulted in greater parental choice of schools for their children. Parents generally have chosen not to "opt out" of local authority control, reflecting perhaps that locally administered education in Scotland is still held in high esteem (Jeyes, 2003).

The effect of market mechanisms and quality assurance procedures at school level will be discussed in the following section with specific reference to the case study school.

2.3.3 The Case Study School

The case study school is situated within an island community (population 20,000). The school (secondary / comprehensive) is part of a small education authority. It currently has a roll of 973 pupils, the majority of whom live within a five-mile radius of the school.

Approximately 20% of pupils travel by boat daily from the inner islands, or are weekly boarders at the school's hostel, if they live on the outer isles. There are seventy-three permanent teaching staff employed in the school, eighteen of whom are

principal teachers (subject / pastoral care), teaching classes S1 to S6. The school provides courses in all main subjects to standard grade, access 3, intermediate 1 / 2, higher and advanced higher levels. Standard grade, access and intermediate 1 level courses are taken over two years, in S3 and S4. Intermediate 2 and higher courses are taken over one year in S5. Advanced higher courses are taken in S6.

Subject departments vary in size from religious education with one principal teacher and one class teacher, to the science department with one principal teacher and eleven class teachers. There had been previously a principal teacher of physics, chemistry and biology within the school. As a result of management re-structuring in 2008 following the McCrone agreement, the three science areas have now been combined, led by myself as principal teacher.

All subjects are grouped into four faculties, with a senior manager being the faculty head. Science, maths, technical and business studies form one faculty. Social subjects, languages, and learning support form a second faculty, with English, drama, and music forming a third. The fourth faculty comprises physical education, computing and pastoral care.

The head teacher is supported by three depute head teachers, and a business manager. There is little turnover of staff within the school, as the majority of teachers are permanently settled within the community, having an average age of forty seven years. However, most departments accommodate either a probationer or student teacher each year, providing a valuable source of new ideas and teaching approaches. The head teacher was promoted from principal teacher, to depute, to head teacher within three years, and has been in the post for ten years.

Within the authority there are two secondary schools on the largest island, four 'junior high' schools on the outer isles, which take pupils until the age of sixteen. These schools offer qualifications to standard grade only, they do not offer higher or advanced higher courses.

Performance management practices within all authority schools including the case study school, involve managers monitoring performance in relation to targets, then re-defining those targets in light of experience. At departmental level within schools, this takes the form of a departmental development plan. Development plans and self-evaluation documents from all school departments are examined to give an indication of performance using the HMIE six point scale, and identify where financial resources may best be allocated to produce measurable improvement. The purpose of self-evaluation procedures is to identify strengths and weaknesses in both provision and performance in order that appropriate continuing professional development and support, may be put in place for teachers. The development plan is augmented by performance data generated by a systematic programme of class observation by principal teachers, and the process of individual career review, for each teacher within the department. The head teacher and senior management team also carry out class observations across all departments, usually in December, January, and February of the school year.

In May of the school year, principal teachers construct a departmental development plan in consultation with classroom teachers. Issues arising from class observations carried out in the winter and spring terms, together with career review data, contribute to these discussions. Areas of future improvement are identified as a result of self-evaluation in line with the five national priorities, and presented as targets for the

following year. How these might be achieved and by whom, are included on the development plan.

Self-evaluation involves completing a 'tick box' document in consultation with class teachers, awarding a score of 1 – 6 (HGIOS 3) as explained previously in section 2.3.1, for priority areas in line with the school development plan. Although evidence is required to verify the scores, it is seldom provided by principal teachers, who argue that the evidence of improvement in learning and teaching for example, is largely subjective. The self-evaluation document together with the development plan is passed onto faculty heads within the hierarchal structure. The development plan is discussed between the faculty head and principal teachers, making sure it includes the national priorities. However, the self-evaluation document is not referred to in these discussions. Both documents are then 'signed off' by the faculty head, and passed to the head teacher. They are copied to the education authority, discussed with a quality improvement officer who attempts to identify trends across the school, and are then filed. Electronic copies of the development plan are then placed on the school network, and are freely available to all staff.

The development planning and self-evaluation process is completed by mid June, with an interim audit of the development plan being carried out between faculty heads and principal teachers in December of the school year. The development plan is not formally referred to again until the following May, when an audit is carried out and a new plan is formed.

Principal teachers are also expected to carry out a formal process of career review with all class teachers once per year, in order to identify weaknesses in professional

practice and implement appropriate Continuing Professional Development (CPD). However, lack of time and the absence of a formal mechanisms of accountability for carrying out the career review process, means that its implementation across the school is inconsistent.

Principal teachers themselves undergo career review once per year in June by their respective faculty heads, which is documented, with a copy being given to both the head teacher and education authority. Faculty heads undergo career review by the head teacher, who is reviewed by the director of education.

In September, principal teachers are required to carry out an analysis of STACS data for their respective departments, although no formal guidelines for how this should be approached are provided, resulting in inconsistency of interpretation. The education authority then requires principal teachers to complete a proforma, once an analysis has been carried out. This information is returned to the education authority and analysed by the quality improvement officer, who discusses the outcomes with the head teacher. Whole school examination data includes relative ratings, which allows departments to compare their performance with each other in the school. Relative ratings show how well pupils perform in one subject compared to the other subjects they are studying. Because relative ratings are school specific performance data, and provide evidence of individual departmental performance, principal teachers feel accountable to both the head teacher and education authority for the outcomes.

The case study school is also accountable for its performance to HMIE, which undertakes aspect inspections on a six year cycle. This involves some departments being examined at one time, such as social subjects, science, or the performing arts.

Inspections currently follow a standards and quality model, where specific aspects of a department are scrutinized such as ethos, resources, curriculum, learning and teaching, support for learning, care and welfare, and leadership. Strengths and weaknesses are identified and discussed with the principal teacher of each department.

The inspection process itself involves a team of five inspectors, one of whom is a lay member, led by a chief inspector who communicates the team's findings directly to the head teacher and local authority. The inspection is carried out in two blocks of four days several weeks apart, and involves the gathering of information from pupils, parents, and teachers. A report is made available to the school sixteen weeks after the inspection, with a public report published in twenty weeks. HMIE may re-visit the school after two years to ensure report recommendations have been successfully put in place. The case study school was inspected in 2001, with a number of recommendations being made regarding the management of the school. The publishing of HMIE reports on Scottish schools has led to the construction, by the media, of school performance league tables, in terms of aspects that are rated from 1-6.

Parental involvement with the school is limited to parent's evenings and information evenings, held once per year for each year group within the school. The school however has an 'open door' policy, where parents may arrange to speak to the head teacher at any time. The school board consists of the head teacher and three elected parent volunteers, together with a teacher representative. It meets three times per year to discuss matters of school policy, and issues concerning parents. The minutes of

these meetings are not generally circulated, but are available on request from the head teacher.

Within the education authority of the case study school, parental choice based on pupil attainment data is limited to one of two secondary schools. The position of each school in the league tables is of limited interest to parents, as selection of an alternative school higher in the league tables would involve perhaps costly geographical location. This in turn could alter the focus of the purpose of self-evaluation procedures within the case study school. Information made available directly to parents includes reports on their child's academic progress, a school newsletter, and letters of information regarding school uniform, awards of merit and so on. The school prospectus contains no evidence of school performance, only general statements from HMIE. School performance data is only available indirectly to parents through the Freedom of Information Act. The school's position in the Scottish examination league tables has fallen each year over the last five years, from being within the top ten Scottish schools, to being in thirty seventh place.

2.4 Implications for Research,

Within primary schools, the monitoring of performance continues to be inconsistent. However, within secondary schools, national examinations provide a valid measure (Cowie and Croxford, 2005). There is a perception amongst teachers that performance management practices such as analysis of examination data, are used in a judgmental way, through the production of league tables for example. However, these can also be enabling through the identification of inequalities within education provision. These inequalities may subsequently be addressed through interventions in the form of targeted support, leading perhaps to changes in policy and practice. This research

attempts to locate evidence of this aspect of performance management within the case study school.

Performance management (quality assurance systems) may be seen as a policy device, which binds together both Government and institutional interests. Pupils, parents, teachers, managers, researchers, and policy makers at all levels of the education service, are increasingly involved with the concepts of performance management and measurement.

Discourses surrounding performance management assume that accountability will lead to improvement. Is this the case in practice within schools? According to Armstrong and Baron (1998:7),

"Performance management is a strategic and integrated approach to delivering sustained success to organizations, by improving the performance of the people who work in them, by developing the capabilities of teams and individual contributors."

Performance management practices such as self-evaluation, class observation, career review, development planning and analysis of examination data, affect relationships between teachers and pupils, teachers and senior managers and between teachers themselves. There is now a clear tension between the teacher's sense of 'what is right' for pupils, and the ultimate goals of performance. Ball(2005:155) states,

"Commitment and experience within practice have to be sacrificed or compromised for impression and performance."

A teacher's commitment and experience may be described as 'authentic practice', where the needs of individuals, and the provision of enjoyable, high quality learning experiences are a priority. Whereas impression and performance may be described as 'performance practice', focusing mainly on the status of the principal teacher within

the school according to external examination results, completion of self-evaluation documents, and development plans.

The focus of this research is to find out if principal teachers within the case study school have managed effectively to separate their sense of 'what is right' (authentic practice) from the goals of quality assurance procedures (performance practice) within their own teaching, management and leadership. It is hoped that the outcomes of this research will contribute to the discourse regarding the effects of performance management in schools, and resonate with similar findings within the literature.

This research has also attempted to discover how principal teachers manage the tension between 'new managerialism' and 'professionalism' within the case study school. Evidence has also been sought for the proposed disjunction between the quality assurance policy of the school, and the preferred practice of principal teachers (McNess, 2003).

2.5 Summary

Knowledge and ideas are now global, marketable commodities. Traditional values in schools have been replaced with market values, including performativity. Intellectual capital forms the core of the knowledge economy, and refers to a capital asset which yields intellectual property rights, and so has economic value.

It is argued that the 'marketisation' of education has replaced traditional values such as community and individual needs with market values such as individualism, competition and performativity. Market mechanisms were introduced as a vehicle for school improvement in a system that was seen as being within the control of

producers (teachers), and not responsive to the needs of consumers (parents and pupils).

The Conservative Government of the 1980's reinforced marketisation of education through the Local Management of Schools initiative, where schools were given control of their own budgets, and day to day management decisions. Budget allocation was determined by the number on the school roll, encouraging schools to compete for pupils, giving rise to a 'quasi-market' in education.

Scottish education has become a significant element of national identity due in part to the prevalence of the myth of the "lad o'pairts". The myth claimed that any young person had the opportunity to progress through the education system, and enter a profession. This was strongly contested as opportunity was not available to girls. However, the myth of equal opportunity has continued to survive, due to its perpetuation by education policy makers.

A comprehensive system of schooling was introduced in Scotland in 1965. The Munn Report of the 1970's supported the existence of distinct subject areas within the curriculum, managed within a departmental structure.

Scottish education is therefore distinct from that of England and Wales, due to high educational values rooted in Scottish history, and linked to national identity. These values include education being a priority within any community, and the right of every child to have the highest quality of education possible. The establishment of a Scottish Parliament in 1999, reinforced this sense of national identity. The first Act passed by the Parliament was the Standards in Scottish Schools Act 2000, which set out a new framework for improvement in schools.

HMIE drives this improvement in quality through self-evaluation procedures using the document HGIOS 3 – The Journey to Excellence, and inspections. The most

important measure of performance however, is pupil attainment. External examination results are collated in the form of STACS data, which facilitates the formation of an informal league table of Scottish schools, and in turn may influence parental choice. Education authorities are accountable for their level of educational provision to the Scottish Government through the service improvement plan, and for the effective implementation of the national priorities in their schools. Head teachers in turn are accountable to the education authority through the school development plan.

Scottish education may be regarded as a 'quasi-market', where pupils and parents are regarded as 'customers' within a controlled market place of school league tables and education authorities. Market mechanisms may have a limited effect on the case study school, which is located within a remote island community, particularly regarding parental choice. However, some evidence of market mechanisms may be seen in the use of self-evaluation, class observation, career review and development planning procedures, by principal teachers within the school.

This research attempts to consider the positive aspect of performance management, by searching for evidence which addresses inequalities in education provision through the lens of performance management practices. Commentators argue that increased accountability will lead to school improvement. This research attempts to find, if this is indeed the situation within the case study school. Evidence is also sought for the existence of a tension between a teacher's sense of 'what is right', and the ultimate goals of performance within a 'marketised' system of education.

Chapter 3

Research Design and Methods

Following the identification of the three research questions in the Introduction, careful consideration was given to the overall selection of the research design, incorporating appropriate methodology, methods, and analytical techniques which would generate the information required to be able to answer the research questions.

This chapter presents the aims of the research in section 3.1. The philosophical stance adopted together with a consideration of the interpretive paradigm of research will be discussed in section 3.1.1. The selection of the case study design and how it is able to successfully address the research questions, will be presented in section 3.1.2. Sections 3.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 will discuss the sampling criteria, participant approach and interview schedule respectively. The interview procedure will be presented in section 3.2.3, together with triangulation using a secondary source of data and participant influence on research method in sections 3.2.4 and 3.2.5. Ethical considerations together with the validity of the interview method and the validity of the data analysis procedures, will be discussed in sections 3.2.6, 3.2.7 and 3.2.8 respectively.

The method of transcription of digital interview recordings is presented in section 3.3, followed by an explanation of the content analysis approach, together with the categories of analysis in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. Section 3.4 includes a description of the approach adopted towards the coding of the research data followed by sample coding frames in section 3.4.1. Finally, a summary of Chapter 3 is presented in section 3.4.2.

3.1 The Aims of the Research

Broadly, the aim of the research was to identify 'authentic' and 'performance' practices in principal teachers within a Scottish secondary school, and investigate whether these have become effectively separated in the context of increasing accountability. The research attempted to find out if principal teachers were sacrificing the authentic priorities of learning and teaching, and meeting the needs of individual pupils, for the demands of performativity such as development planning, and the career reviews of teachers within their departments for example.

In order to carry out the research, it was necessary to find out how principal teachers *felt* personally about the impact of performance management practices, and document their individual perspectives.

Principal teachers *perceptions* of performance management practices were recorded, rather than the use of observational data, which may have been intrusive and therefore counter productive. Observational data could have been gathered by attending departmental meetings for example, where development planning was being discussed. The presence of myself as the researcher, could have altered the dynamic of the meeting by causing stress to the participants. This in turn might have resulted in the response of the principal teacher to development planning issues being affected.

The varying impact of performance management practices at different times within the school academic year was investigated by interviewing principal teachers in May, and again in September, when principal teachers were involved with performance management practices. It was hoped to reveal whether principal teachers were under different performance pressures in May and September of the school year, and if so,

to identify those demands of performance which were most prevalent. In May, principal teachers were required to complete department development plans and career review of staff. In September, principal teachers analysed examination (STACS) data, and produced a Standards and Quality report.

The difference in perspectives between principal teachers of subject, pastoral care and the head teacher, was also investigated. If performance management practices are interpreted in different ways within an organisation, then their overall effectiveness is perhaps questionable.

The specific aims of the research were as follows;

1. To define "authentic" and "performance" practices within schooling, and attempt to identify these within the research data.
2. To identify principal teachers perceptions of performance management practices, and investigate commonalities and differences of these perceptions in May and September of the school year.
3. To discover how development planning as a specific tool of performance management, impacts on the professional practice of principal teachers.
4. To explore differences in the perception of performance practices, between principal teachers of subject and pastoral care, and the head teacher.
5. To consider the effectiveness of the current model of formal accountability within the case study school.

These aims provided a focus when researching the literature, which in turn influenced the construction of the research questions, as explained in the Introduction, which were as follows;

1. "What are the perceptions of principal teachers of performance management practices at different times within the school academic year?"
2. "How does performance management impact on the professional practice of principal teachers within learning and teaching, together with the management of a department?"
3. "What impact does development planning as a tool of performance management, have on the professional practice of principal teachers?"

An attempt was made to address these research questions, through an interpretive paradigm of enquiry.

3.1.1 Philosophical Position

The ontological stance adopted within this research is that of "subtle realism" which claims that the social world exists independently of individual, subjective understanding, but is only accessible to us via respondent's interpretations, which in turn are interpreted by the researcher (Hammersley, 1992). Respondents own interpretations of research issues are important, with varied perspectives producing different types of understanding. These varied perspectives however, do not deny the existence of an external reality, but confirm its diversity. This complexity of perspectives adds richness to the various ways in which reality may be experienced, and the intention of this research is to convey as detailed an account as possible of that diverse reality.

The philosophical position of 'realism' has been accepted as an external reality, which exists independently of people's beliefs or understanding. It represents a distinction between the way the world *is*, and the meaning and interpretation of that world held by individuals.

The "subtle realism" stance that has been adopted, proposes that a diverse social reality exists independently of people's representations of it, and reality is only knowable through the human mind and socially constructed meanings. This research will attempt to discover the socially constructed meaning of "performance management" by principal teachers and senior managers, and how this in turn affects their professional reality of day-to-day work in school.

A sociological theory of "truth" has been accepted, which proposes that reality can only be gauged in a consensual, rather than absolute way. If several reports confirm a statement, then it may be considered true, as a representation of a socially constructed reality.

The epistemological approach will be conducted through the interpretive paradigm of research, which is characterized by concern for the individual (Cohen and Manion, 1989:22).

The interpretive paradigm focuses on how both the researcher and social world impact on each other. Facts and values are not distinct, with findings influenced by the perspectives and values of the researcher. It is not possible for the researcher to be "value free", and as a result, must be transparent regarding assumptions made.

Research traditions within the interpretive paradigm, include phenomenology, ethnomethodology, symbolic interactionism and feminist standpoint methodology.

Phenomenology and ethnomethodology both attempt to understand the constructs people use in everyday life to make sense of their world, through uncovering meanings contained within conversation or text.

Symbolic interactionism attempts to explore behaviour and social rules, in order to understand how people interpret and react to their environment (Cohen and Manion, 1989). Subsequently, for the purposes of this research, grounded theory is accepted, as it involves the development of 'emergent' theories of social action, through identification of analytical categories, and the relationship between them.

According to Kellehear (1993:4),

"A theory is a statement about relationships between variables or concepts."

Theories shape how people explain what they observe. They are a particular type of interpretive framework, which describes general patterns of social behaviour, but are not absolute rules or laws, rather a product of particular historical or cultural situations (Kellehear, 1993:4).

The purpose of the grounded theory approach, is to construct a new theory which relates to a specific situation. This research attempts to generate an inductive theory from the systematic collection and analysis of data gathered during the semi structured interviews with principal teachers which may hopefully, contribute to the discourse surrounding the effects of performativity on professional practice.

Within the paradigm of grounded theory, I as a researcher recognise the role of deductive theory generated from the literature, in providing direction to the questions that required to be explored within the research. The theory proposed by McNess et.

al. highlighting the disjunction between policy and practice of teachers, was influential in the focus of this research.

Feminist standpoint epistemologies reject the modernist scientific assumption that there is a single ideal "knower", and that he can know, or describe one true, final correct representation of reality. Feminist standpoint epistemologies argue that knowledge is always situated, and what is "known" is influenced by the shared experiences and political orientations of the standpoint of the person who "knows". I adopted this philosophical position, in order to reflect my personal perspective of knowledge and situated reality, as a researcher and member of the learning community within the case study school.

This research accepts the feminist standpoint epistemology, in agreement with Ezzy (2002:20) who states,

"All knowledge is knowledge from where a person stands."

According to Harding (1987:22),

"Standpoint theory does not claim that a female standpoint provides one true account of social reality, but does claim that female standpoints provide a "less false" account of social life."

The selection of a feminist standpoint epistemology, which is relevant to this research, is confirmed by Smith (1997:392) who states,

"If you want to understand society, you need to understand it from the perspective of the people who are participants in it."

Feminist standpoint epistemology takes shared political and social experiences, and presents an account of both experience and an approach to politics, from the standpoint of these groups (Ezzy, 2002:20). It is these principles of the feminist

standpoint epistemology which are being adopted within this research, rather than the perspective of gender issues.

Research within the field of performance management began within industry, where the validity of findings were "assured" by empirical evidence. This was important, as industrial management was linked to productivity, and therefore economic output. The notion of research into performance management was subsequently applied to schools, which inherited the positivist philosophy from industry. Within the positivist tradition, both the characteristics and activities of people are regarded as scientific "variables'. It is to these variables that researchers look in order to explain the world, and make predictions of what may happen in the future.

In order to discover how performance management practices impacted on the professional practice of principal teachers within the case study school, an interpretive paradigm of research was selected.

Within the interpretive paradigm, I as the researcher actively became part of the research itself, exploring the meaning of events from the participant's perspective.

Within the case study, interviews with principal teachers were conducted within the school where they worked, a natural setting, and it was recognized that context was heavily implicated in the meaning of the responses.

Principal teachers themselves were the research instrument, who approached the interview with previously formed opinions and knowledge, which was unavoidable.

Qualitative methods such as interviewing participants were more acceptable to the people involved, rather than quantitative methods such as completing questionnaires.

Although this research looked for examples of 'authentic' and 'performance' and 'integrated' practices within the responses of principal teachers, no critical theory was proposed at the beginning of the work, instead it emerged from the data generated.

3.1.2 Case Study Methodology

In order to investigate the perceptions of principal teachers of performance management, within a Scottish secondary school, and how this impacts on individual professional practice within a particular model of organizational management, a case study design was selected.

It was appropriate for this research, as according to Yin (1989:21),

"Case study is founded on observation and experience, rather than on theory, and tries to explain how things are taking place, and why."

This design generated different perspectives rooted in a specific context, which came from multiple accounts, collected using primarily a single method, the semi-structured interview, from people with different perspectives on performance management, in the case of this research, principal teachers within a Scottish secondary school.

A case study design was also appropriate to this research, as it is generally used when no single perspective can provide a full explanation of the research issue, and where understanding needs to be holistic, comprehensive and contextualised (Scholz and Tietje,2002:52).

Yin (1994:41) argues that,

"A crucial distinction must be made between holistic and embedded case studies."

The case study design used within this research, involving a sample of the staff of one school, took the form of a qualitative approach, relying primarily on narrative and phenomenological descriptions. Producing evidence to support theories derived from the literature, as discussed in Chapter 1, from the case study of one school is difficult. However, a case study approach has the potential to,

- Contribute to the formative evaluation of performance management and subsequent policy making within the case study school.
- Generate qualitative data, which will form part of an archive of material, sufficiently rich to allow subsequent re-interpretation by other researchers.
- Present outcomes in a more publicly accessible form, contributing to the democratization of decision-making.

(Adapted from Adelman et.al.1989)

A single case design may be considered unique, prototypical, salient or revelatory to the understanding of a phenomenon or problem (Scholz and Tietje, 2002:11).

The principal strengths of the case study design within this research are threefold. First, it focuses on participants as unique individuals, and seeks to understand their perceptions of real events. Second, the researcher is a vital actor within the case, whose interaction with participants facilitates the generation of information, and takes into account the subtleties and complexities of the case. Third, an attempt is made to portray the unique richness of the case to readers through the production of an accessible final report (Cohen and Manion, 2000).

It is acknowledged that the case study approach also has a number of weaknesses. The findings of the research are not usually generalizable, but may prompt debate and further research. Also, I as a researcher, was aware of some aspects of case study

design, which could affect the validity of the research findings. It is acknowledged that holistic case studies have the potential to be highly subjective, and include the personal values of the researcher, although efforts were made to avoid this. The advantage of holding a professional position myself within the case study school of equal status to the participants, was that during eleven years of service, I had accumulated a significant amount of 'social capital', and was trusted by my colleagues. This made participants feel at ease and able to speak freely, when responding to interview questions.

Informal discussion on performance management practices, such as development planning and self-evaluation, also took place within the staff room of the case study school. In these instances I became an 'active listener', taking care not to voice my own opinions, but asking questions which generated further debate amongst colleagues. The general outcomes of these informal discussions were noted within a 'field note' diary on leaving the staff room, and used to aid interpretation of the interview data. Individuals were not identified within the field note diary, and the document was shredded when the analysis of data had been completed.

All data was included and thoroughly analyzed, with the "cherry picking" of only interesting features being avoided, in order to minimize the distortion of findings. It was equally important to avoid selecting only that evidence which supported a particular conclusion, and overemphasizing details to the detriment of seeing the whole picture. Including only aspects of the research data with which people might agree, rather than disagree, was avoided (Nisbett and Watt, 1984:91) as will be discussed later in section 3.4.

Finally, the case study methodology selected within this research may be described as

both "holistic" and "exploratory". Holistic case studies allow for the evaluation of complex programmes, with an exploratory dimension allowing insight into the structure of a phenomenon in order to develop hypotheses, models or theories.

3.2 Sampling Criteria

Of the eighteen principal teachers within the case study school, a sample of five was selected for interview in May and again in August of the school academic year of 2007. The size of the sample, although small, was large enough to produce rich data and accomplish what was intended by the analysis of the data generated, that is, to discover the perceptions of principal teachers in different subject areas within the case study school, regarding performance management practices such as self-evaluation, career review, class observation, development planning, and the subsequent effects of these on their professional practice.

It is acknowledged that a wider sample of principal teachers from a large number of secondary schools, would potentially have produced a more generalizable picture, however the richness and depth of the data generated by the smaller sample offset this disadvantage to some extent.

As a specific group of principal teachers within the case study school was the main focus of the research, this was indicative of a non-probability, purposive sampling technique.

The five principal teachers, three subject and two pastoral care, within the sample group were specifically chosen to give as far as possible, a representative spread of gender, experience and responsibilities within the school. The principal teachers were

identified as A, B, C, D and E as it might have been possible to identify them by the posts which they held within the case study school. Several other potential participants were selected in the event of a principal teacher from the original group not wishing to take part, or withdrawing at any time. The head teacher was also interviewed, in order to obtain his perceptions of the nature and purpose of performance management, and of the role of principal teachers within that system.

3.2.1 Participant Approach

The participant letter set out briefly the purpose of the research, the data gathering procedure through a personal interview, reassurance of confidentiality and a return slip agreeing to take part, and suggesting a suitable time for interview.

It was important to make a personal, rather than a general approach to the potential participants, as it hopefully made them feel valued and be more positive about the research. The fact that principal teachers have very little time to spare during the working day was acknowledged by allowing them to choose when they might be interviewed, rather than stating a time for them to take part.

Communication by letter was made through the pigeonhole system within the staff room of the case study school. This was followed by informal verbal communication between myself as researcher, and the participants regarding any points which required clarification, suitable times for interview and so on. Copies of the participant letters may be found in appendix1.

The views of the head teacher were also of interest to this research, to compare with principal teacher's views. He was approached personally, following making an

appointment, and a time was agreed for the interview to take place.

3.2.2 Interview Schedule

It was intended to conduct semi-structured interviews with the participants, where a schedule was prepared, which was sufficiently open ended to enable the contents to be re-ordered, digressions and expansions to be made, new avenues to be included, and further probing to be undertaken (Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2000:146).

An interview schedule was constructed, within which it was hoped that the set of eight questions would generate enough information to be able to provide an answer to each of the research questions, presented previously in the Introduction.

3.2.3 Interview Procedure

Principal teachers completed and returned the slips from the letter of approach, confirming the time of their interview.

Interviews were held in a small office adjoining my own classroom within the case study school. Attention was paid to the interview environment, to ensure participants would be comfortable, and feel able to speak freely. Lighting and room temperature were adjusted, and a number of plants added to soften the "office" environment. Two chairs were placed at a forty-five degree angle to a small desk. This prevented the 'domination" of the participant by the interviewer. A digital recorder was placed on the top of the desk, together with a pen, notebook and fresh water. To prevent interruptions, a notice was placed on the door that stated, "Interview in Progress, Do

Not Enter".

Each principal teacher was interviewed individually, with myself as researcher together with the participant, the only people present within the room. Upon arrival, each participant was welcomed and invited to take a seat. They were again thanked for taking part, and permission was sought to switch on the digital recorder, together with the assurance that strict confidentiality would be observed. It was explained that I as the researcher would be the only person to hear the interviews, and following analysis in which each response would be referred to by a number, the recordings would be deleted. Participants were given the opportunity to withdraw at this or any other time, if they were unsure of any aspect of the research.

The duration of each interview was open ended, in order to encourage free discussion, however the average duration of the interviews was thirty-five minutes. It was intended to make field notes during the interviews, however this proved to be difficult while engaged in active listening. Instead, field notes were made after each participant had left the interview room on the general demeanour of the participant, incidents which had occurred prior to the interview, technical problems and so on. Field notes were destroyed as soon as possible following data analysis.

Each interview began with an overview of the research, and the importance of the role of each participant. This led into the first question from the interview schedule, to initiate discussion. I as the researcher made eye contact with the interviewee, leant forward to show interest, smiled and showed confirmation of what was being said. I responded to each participant, and maintained the pace of the interview by prompting, supporting, empathizing, clarifying, exemplifying, summarizing and avoiding censure

(Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2000:146). Where participants hesitated, or were unsure of meanings, clarification was given. If asked for my opinion, I tried to remain neutral, and framed my response within another question.

When each interview came naturally to an end, this was indicated to participants by thanking them for taking part, and inviting them to make any additional comments to me regarding the research or the interview process either verbally, or by e-mail. The digital recorder was switched off, and there then followed several minutes of "winding down" conversation before the participant left the room. All participants commented that the experience had been enjoyable, and they had welcomed the opportunity to engage in professional dialogue with a colleague. Field notes were then made for the next twenty minutes. Following the interviews in May, each principal teacher was given a brief, general summary of the findings so far to comment upon when they returned for a second interview in September.

Potential bias in this source of primary data is acknowledged, as each principal teacher may have used the interview process as an opportunity to air current grievances, particularly concerning senior management. I personally had a perspective on performance management practices that I endeavoured to keep separate from the interview process, but I could not guarantee that they did not have any influence on my questioning technique.

The digital recordings were downloaded onto a computer as sound files, and transcribed by the author using Olympus software, providing a primary data source for analysis. The files from the digital recorder were then deleted.

3.2.4 Secondary Source of Data

In order to discover if the perceptions of principal teachers about performance management practices within the case study school, were reflected by the head teacher and senior management team on a whole school basis, the minutes for the senior management team meetings held weekly between May 2007 and May 2008 were analysed.

The senior management team meetings were held each Monday afternoon at 4 p.m. within the head teacher's office, and were attended by the head teacher (Chair), three depute head teachers and a principal teacher representative. Minutes were taken by the head teacher, which were a brief summary of the main topics of discussion, and sent by e-mail each week to all principal teachers. These minutes were collected electronically and stored in a folder for subsequent analysis.

It is acknowledged that many details of senior management team discussions did not appear in the minutes, and that as the author was the head teacher, there was indeed bias towards a political agenda. However, this source of secondary data did give an indication of the importance to the head teacher and senior management team of performance management practices such as self-evaluation and development planning, in the management of the school.

The self-evaluation returns of all principal teachers were collected and read for the year 2006-07. Patterns in data were noted, particularly the scores assigned to each quality indicator, although a quantitative analysis of the data was not pursued.

3.2.5 Participant Influence on Research Method

Prior to commencing the research, a pilot study was undertaken where a draft of the interview schedule was trialled with six principal teachers who did not subsequently take part in the main research project. The interview procedure was successful, however a number of faults were exposed within the interview schedule.

A number of participants had difficulty understanding the term "performance management". Although this is the term used within the literature, within schools it is more commonly referred to as "quality assurance". Therefore, the wording of question 3 in the interview schedule was subsequently changed. The term "performance management" was replaced with the term "quality assurance."

In the original interview schedule, the question "to whom are you accountable?" appeared as question 5. However, it became clear due to the hesitation and confusion of participants, that this question was in the wrong place, and obstructed the flow of the discussion. The question was relocated at the end of the interview, and subsequently became question 8.

Trialling the interview questions with a pilot group of principal teachers, enabled the preparation of additional prompts to use within the main study if required. It was also during the pilot study that the logistics of taking field notes during the interviews was found to be difficult, and that writing notes during the interview made participants uncomfortable.

Overall, the comments of the participants within the pilot study were positive and encouraging, which was helpful in validating the research method.

The small scale pilot study carried out prior to the research, where the interview schedule questions were trialled using a different group of principal teachers, indicated that changes in wording, emphasis and order of questions were required in order to generate the information needed to address the research questions. These changes were duly made, resulting in eight questions that were used as a framework for discussion during the interviews. Additional questions were posed by myself as researcher in order to open out points made by the participants during the interviews. The questions were as follows,

1. What would you say have been your priorities over the last working week?
2. Would you say these are fairly typical of the time of year? If not, how are they different and why? If so, why have you prioritised them above other demands on your time?
3. The term "quality assurance" is frequently used in education. What does this term mean to you?
4. Taking one mechanism of quality assurance, such as self-evaluation, can you give an example of one way in which their use has directly affected learning and teaching, and management within your department?
5. What do you see as being the main purpose of the departmental development plan? How does it relate to the school development plan, and the development plans of other departments?

6. How does the production of a departmental development plan affect learning and teaching, management of your department and your personal teaching practice?
7. How useful to you is STACS data in development planning?
8. To whom are you accountable?

An approach was also made to the head teacher to discover his perspectives on performance management practices together with those of his principal teachers. The interview schedule was similar, but focused on a whole school perspective. The framework of questions used during the interview of the head teacher were as follows,

1. What are the main strategic priorities of the head teacher and senior management team at this time?
2. What do you understand by the term "quality assurance" as it relates to the school, and in particular the meaning of self-evaluation?
3. How do self-evaluation procedures within the school affect learning and teaching, management of staff, and management of the school?
4. How does departmental development planning affect the work of principal teachers specifically within the areas of learning and teaching, departmental management, and professional practice?
5. How does the school development plan influence the management of all departments within the school?
6. How useful is STACS data in school development planning?

It must be emphasized that the interview schedules were used as frameworks for discussion, with many supplementary questions being asked in order to mine as much information as possible. These additional questions were generated by the responses of the principal teachers and head teacher.

The purpose of the interview process was to access the feelings of principal teachers and the head teacher regarding performance management practices, and to elicit possible reasons and explanations for these.

3.2.6 Ethical Considerations

A summary of the research proposal was discussed with the head teacher of the case study school, and the education authority. Permission was obtained to proceed with the research, approach participants, and interrogate secondary data. It was intended at the outset, to involve all participants fully in the shaping of the work.

The time and location of participant interviews were negotiated, to take into account individual preferences and other responsibilities, with the right of participants to withdraw at any stage made clear. At the beginning of each interview, permission was sought to make a digital recording, with the assurance given that I as researcher, would be the only person to hear it, or read the resulting transcript. As mentioned previously, each participant was assured that the recording would be deleted immediately. All field notes were kept strictly confidential, and destroyed as soon as possible.

All work was open and visible, with suggestions for modification welcomed, and an opportunity for participants to question the work provided. A short paper comparing

some of the main themes, which arose during the interviews with the literature, was given to participants to read and comment upon.

Permission was obtained from each participant before using direct quotations within the research. Although I was at times approached by principal teachers who were not part of the research project, I did not reveal the content of any discussions that had taken place. It is intended that the general findings of the research will be made available to the education authority, head teacher, senior managers and principal teachers for information and comment, in the form of a "bulletin".

It was recognized that I as researcher, had the absolute responsibility to maintain complete confidentiality throughout this work, while being sensitive to each individual's needs and situation.

As a principal teacher within the case study school, I was also aware of the pressures colleagues were under as a result of performance management practices. These pressures were more intense in May and September of the school year. I knew therefore, that these were the times when colleagues would welcome the opportunity to discuss performance management issues. Informal discussions with principal teachers throughout the school confirmed this view.

The head teacher, at the beginning of 2007, had concerns that self-evaluation procedures within the school were not working. These concerns were expressed to me during informal discussions regarding faculty issues. It became clear that this research might be able to provide some explanation, and perhaps more importantly, raise new questions about the role of self-evaluation in the improvement of learning and teaching within the school.

3.2.7 Validity of the Interview Method

The validity of the interview method may have been undermined by bias, which is defined by Lansing, Ginsberg and Braaten (1961) as,

"A systematic or persistent tendency to make errors in the same direction, that is to overstate or understate the true value of an attribute."

This may have caused a variation in the responses of participants, depending on a number of variable factors such as professional relationships within the school, stress, work load, health and so on. The investigation of the effects of these variables however, was beyond the scope of the research project.

Significant efforts were made within the interview situation to minimize bias as much as possible, although it is acknowledged that it could not be removed completely. This was attempted by neutralizing my own personal opinions, and avoiding soliciting responses that might lend support to my own personal theories. Clarification was sought from participants regarding responses given which I did not fully comprehend.

As a principal teacher within the case study school, I was known personally to all participants, and held an equal position of power within the school. Hopefully, this helped to place participants at ease, and encourage them to speak openly. However, it is acknowledged that I as the researcher, however neutral I tried to be, would have some influence on the participants and subsequently the data produced.

It is recognized that while interviewing the five principal teachers in May and again in September of the school year, some *transference* occurred, where the feelings, needs, fears, and attitudes from the experiences of the participants, were transferred onto

myself as the researcher (Scheurich, 1995). Evidence for transference was my tired, and sometimes emotional state following the conclusion of an interview.

The overall validity of the interview method was, it is hoped, enhanced by the implementation of a pilot study, and the presentation of the same interview questions to all participants in May and again in September. It is acknowledged that validity may have been compromised by the pursuit of individual lines of discussion with each participant. However, this was perhaps compensated for by the production of a rich, thick and diverse data set for subsequent analysis.

The sample of five principal teachers selected for the purposes of the research, were representative of the population of principal teachers within the case study school. However, it is acknowledged that this sample may not be representative of the population of principal teachers throughout Scottish schools.

Although every effort was made to maximize the validity of the research, it is acknowledged that compromises had to be made, and that the data generated from the principal teacher interviews might be regarded as valid within the framework of the research project itself.

3.2.8 Validity of Data Analysis Procedures

The issue of validity was considered at all stages of the data analysis procedure, with a primary focus on reducing invalidity of data as far as possible within the research.

Following the interview process in May, a summary of the main themes that had emerged was provided for each participant to comment upon, and validate. During all interviews, strident attempts were made by myself as the researcher to remain neutral within body language, comments and thoughts, thereby reducing the 'halo effect' as

far as possible.

Transcription of all interviews was carried out promptly by myself as the researcher, using a consistent approach to reviewing and annotating the data. This allowed for moderation, where consistent meaning was applied throughout.

Neutrality was maintained throughout a rigorous coding procedure, where an awareness of personal ideas and theories was acknowledged, avoiding their subsequent influence on the possible selective use of data.

3.3 Transcription of Digital Interview Recordings

Each participant was interviewed on a separate day. At the end of each day, the digital voice recorder was connected to a computer, and the information downloaded as a sound file. Transcription of the sound files was carried out as soon as possible after the interviews had taken place, in order to minimize distortion and loss of data. The sound files were transcribed by myself as the researcher, which proved to be a crucial step in the initial stage of analysis, as patterns and themes within the data began to emerge and were noted. The process of transcription was carried out systematically, in a quiet room with no interruptions. Once an initial transcript had been typed, the recording was listened to again several times, and corrections made. Spot checks were made on transcripts in an attempt to clean up data. The final transcript was annotated to indicate silences, tone of voice, speed of talking, reason for pauses (thinking, coughing and so on.) The transcript of each participant was identified using a number code. A sample transcript may be found in appendix 5.

It is acknowledged that transcribing information from one form to another, in this case sound recordings to text, a degree of interpretation has already taken place,

resulting inevitably in some loss of data. Mishler (1991:260) proposes that data and the relationship between meaning and language are contextually situated; they are unstable, changing and capable of endless interpretation.

3.3.1 Content Analysis Approach

The method of data analysis selected was 'content analysis", as this involves deductively derived theory, and deductively driven analysis to work down from pre-existing theoretical understandings (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Through the deductive theoretical approach, I as a researcher recognised the role of pre-existing theory within the literature in providing direction to the questions that need to be explored. However, throughout the research, I endeavoured to adopt a neutral stance, being vigilant to recognise and examine emerging concepts and themes beyond those proposed by a deductively derived theory.

The theory proposed within this research is that performance management practices within the case study school, impact on the professional practice of principal teachers, and that they may exhibit professional behaviours which may be described as 'authentic' or 'performance' practices. Which of these practices principal teachers exhibit may be influenced by the pressures upon them at different times within the school year, namely May and September. The pre-existing theory of this research proposes that 'authentic' practice may have been diminished within Scottish schools, as a result of the demands generated by performance management practices.

The three main categories of analysis were 'authentic practice' and 'performance practice' and 'integrated practice', which are described fully in the following sections, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3. This pre-existing theory was tested against the data generated from the interviews.

During the principal teacher interviews, responses were recorded for each of the eight questions. This involved a degree of interpretation by myself as the researcher. The responses were coded within three categories of analysis, 'authentic practice', 'performance practice' and 'behaviours which integrate authentic and performance practices', (coding procedures will be discussed fully in section 3.4).

The number of principal teachers responding for each code within 'authentic', 'performance' and 'integrated' practices, for each interview question is presented in the form of a table. The frequency of responses within each category immediately follows each table, and is calculated by dividing the number of responses for each category by the total number of responses for that question, expressed as a percentage. This in turn is followed by a brief, descriptive commentary for each table. The information is presented in the form of tables for both the May and September interviews, and is discussed fully in Chapter 4 sections 4.1 to 4.3.

Patterns and themes began to arise from the data, and were noted. Ambiguous or general responses were broken down, in an attempt to reveal their true meaning, and avoid the integration and therefore loss of data.

Commonalities and differences between the responses of the five principal teachers at different times within the school year were examined, and possible reasons for these

considered, which are discussed fully in Chapter 5. The responses of the head teacher were compared with those of the principal teachers, and the evidence within the senior management team minutes, providing triangulation of the data, and it is hoped, enhanced validity.

3.3.2 Categories of Analysis

Prior to commencing the research, an attempt was made to define the professional actions that would constitute 'authentic' and 'performance' practices within the daily work of principal teachers and the head teacher, resulting in the construction of the following categories of analysis (3.3.3). These were drawn from the literature reviewed in both Chapters 1 and 2. 'Authentic' practice could be described as the teacher's sense of "what is right" focusing on relationships and the needs of individuals, whereas 'performance' practice focuses mainly on superficial goals of performance within the school.

3.3.3 Authentic Practice – Principal Teachers	*3.3.4 Performance Practice – Principal Teachers*
Articulating sense of "what is right", addressing needs/concerns of individuals	Addressing superficial goals of performance, attainment of year groups.
Changing learning and teaching according to context	Pursuing learning and teaching methods that result in higher QI score.
Teaching only relevant parts of the curriculum	Teaching curriculum to satisfy self-evaluation requirements.
Majority of time spent on learning and teaching	Majority of time spent on self-evaluation documents, departmental development plan, standards and quality

	report, providing evidence for these.
Focus on personal, professional priorities rather than those of the departmental/ school development plans	Focusing only on priority areas set down in HGIOS2 and the school development plan.
Teaching priority to develop thinking/personal skills of pupils	Teaching only to improve examination results.
Self-evaluation not continuous throughout the year	Self – evaluation documents completed once per year.
Management priorities – managing people, change, curriculum development, learning and teaching, resources, budget.	Management priorities – providing evidence of improved attainment, career review of Staff, provision of CPD, construction of a departmental development plan, use of QI's to evaluate areas specified in HGIOS2.

3.3.5 Authentic Practice – Head Teacher	*3.3.6 Performance Practice – Head Teacher*
Addressing individual pupil, staff, parent issues arising.	Self-evaluation carried out and school development plan referred to throughout the year.
Development of learning and teaching throughout the school.	Staff career reviews / CPD / class observations / discussion of departmental development plans and standards and quality reports with principal teachers.
Review and development of the curriculum.	Audit and production of school development plan.
	Meetings with quality improvement officers.

3.4 Approach to Coding of Research Data

In general terms, coding of data

"...is the process of defining what the data are all about" (Charmaz, 1995:37).

Within this research, coding was used to facilitate the identification of emergent themes within the data, and thus attempt to construct an account of the data generated from the interviews.

Using the categories of analysis described within the preceding section, letter codes were allocated to each descriptor, and a preliminary coding frame constructed. Responses to the eight interview questions were coded accordingly. New codes were devised to include all responses, and added to the coding frame. Codes were also allocated to those responses which intersected 'authentic' and 'performance' practices, and could not fit cleanly into either category of analysis. These were referred to as "integrated practices". The process of axial coding (Straus and Corbin, 1990) was then employed in order to integrate codes (by exploring the relationship between codes), around the axes of central categories, and so 'condense' the data into a manageable form, which subsequently began to reveal the main themes of 'accountability', 'management' and 'performance' emerging from the interview data.

3.4.1 Coding Frames

The coding frames used to record responses of 'authentic' and 'performance' practice in principal teachers and the head teacher will be presented in Appendices 2 and 3 respectively, together with the coding frame used for those responses from principal teachers which intersected both 'authentic' and 'performance' practices, namely 'integrated practice' The codes used were more extensive than those derived from the

literature, to accommodate the wide range of information generated from the interviews. This provides evidence that although informed by the literature, the coding process was alert to new themes generated by the research data, resulting in the addition of new codes, which are denoted by an asterix (*).

There was a significant increase in the categories of performance practice compared to authentic practice, following the analysis of the research data. This is examined fully in Chapter 4, where the results of the research are presented.

3.4.2 Summary

The aim of this research is to identify 'authentic' and 'performance' practices in principal teachers within a Scottish secondary school, and discover if there is a disjunction between them. The research favours a 'subtle realism' ontology, an interpretive epistemology, and attempts through the paradigm of grounded theory, to discover how principal teachers feel about the demands of performativity on their professional practice. The interpretive paradigm includes the philosophical traditions of phenomenology, naturalism and hermeneutics. The case study research design was selected, as it was able to generate personal perspectives rooted in a specific context. Information was collected from participants using a semi-structured interview, which was digitally recorded.

Following the construction of an interview schedule, five principal teachers were interviewed individually in depth, generating rich data. Changes were made to the interview schedule according to participant responses, in order to generate as much information as possible. I as the researcher made every effort to avoid influencing participants with my own views, either directly or indirectly. Perspectives of the head

teacher were also sought through a personal interview. Secondary data was provided by the management team minutes 2007-08.

Ethical considerations applied throughout the research, where discretion and confidentiality were assured.

Interview recordings were transcribed as soon as possible, beginning the process of data analysis. A content analysis approach was selected, involving deductively derived theory and analysis to work down from pre-existing theoretical understandings (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

The main categories of analysis were 'authentic' and 'performance' practice, for both the principal teachers and head teacher. Following the construction of a preliminary coding frame, further codes were inductively generated as the interviews progressed. The emerging data highlighted the need for codes which intersected both 'authentic' and 'performance' practice, as it was difficult to categorize responses as one or the other. Responses which could be interpreted as either 'authentic' or 'performance' practice, were referred to as 'integrated practice'.

The number of principal teachers responding within each code, for each interview question categorised as the three types of practice, are presented in the form of tables in Chapter 4, together with the frequency of coded responses for the head teacher.

Chapter 4

Results of Research

This chapter interrogates both the principal and head teacher question response tables, compiled following axial coding from the transcribed principal teacher and head teacher interview data. A commentary on the question response tables 1- 16 from principal teacher interviews in May and September 2007, is presented in section 4.1.

The results tables 1 – 8, displaying the question responses generated from the principal teacher interviews in May 2007, together with their associated commentaries, are presented in section 4.2. A summary of the principal teacher responses in May is presented in section 4.3.

The results tables 9 – 16, displaying the question responses generated from the principal teacher interviews in September 2007, together with their associated commentaries, are presented in section 4.4. A commentary on the head teacher responses are presented in section 4.5. The head teacher responses to interview questions in May are displayed in table 17, within section 4.5.1.

The analysis of secondary data in the form of minutes of the senior management team meetings between May 2007 and May 2008 are presented in section 4.6, under the main themes of departmental development plans and the school development plan in section 4.6.1, quality assurance in section 4.6.2, operational and administrative issues in section 4.6.3, discipline in section 4.6.4, education management in section 4.6.5

and national priorities in section 4.6.6. Themes relevant to this research which appeared to be absent from the minutes of the senior management team are considered in section 4.6.7.

A summary of the principal teacher responses to the eight interview questions in May and September of the school year, is presented in section 4.7. This is followed by a final summary of the principal teacher responses in section 4.7.1.

Finally, a summary of the head teacher responses to the eight interview questions is presented in section 4.7.2.

4.1 Commentary on the Principal Teacher Question Response Tables 1 - 16

Following the coding of data which differentiated between 'integrated, performance and authentic' practice as previously discussed in section 3.4, the responses of principal teachers and the head teacher to each of the eight interview questions, are presented as tables for each of the three categories.

In the tables which follow, the number of principal teachers responding with an example of performance, authentic or integrated practice is given within each table, in response to each of the eight interview questions in turn. The number of principal teachers responding is presented within column one, with the appropriate code letter and meaning, following in columns two and three respectively for each section of the table representing performance, authentic and integrated practice.

The decision was taken to focus on the analysis of the number of teachers responding within each code, rather than on the number of utterances of particular codes, in order to gain an overview of how examples of performance, authentic and integrated practice were evident within the interviews of the sample group of principal teachers, subsequently perhaps influencing their professional practice.

For each of the eight interview questions, the number of codes generated representing examples of performance, authentic and integrated practice, gave an indication of the number of different ways in which each type of practice was evident within the interviews of the five principal teachers. It was assumed that the greater the number of codes generated reflecting a particular type of professional practice, the higher the priority of that practice amongst principal teachers.

Initially, the number of utterances of each code by principal teachers was considered for analysis. However, this approach was rejected as the pilot study revealed the number of utterances of a particular code increased, where a principal teacher was perceived to be having difficulty in articulating their response to a particular question. Therefore, the number of utterances did not relate to the importance each principal teacher placed upon a particular aspect of performance management.

A detailed analysis of each principal teacher narrative was also considered, however this was rejected as it would have been more difficult to focus on specific areas of performativity which underpinned the research.

Although the assumption is being made, that the greater the impact of a particular professional practice on principal teachers, is reflected in the number of codes generated in response to a question, it is acknowledged that there is a certain degree of error here. However, a consistent approach to data analysis throughout the research, together with acknowledgement of potential inaccuracies, has provided valid data on which to base conclusions.

The number of codes out of the total number generated for each category of performance, authentic or integrated practice, is given at the foot of each table as an indication of the importance of a particular category to principal teachers when

responding to a particular question. The number of codes generated for a particular type of practice, out of the total number of codes generated for the question, is also expressed as a percentage in parenthesis. It is assumed that the higher the percentage, the more significant the practice is to principal teachers.

From the interview transcripts, the responses of each individual principal teacher to each of the eight questions in both May and September, were listed and given a code. The codes were then identified as being examples of performance, authentic or integrated practice.

The number of principal teachers who generated a particular code within the three types of performance practice, are given in the results tables, together with the meaning of each code. Where the number of principal teachers generating a particular code are indicated as one, several times within a results table, this represents the responses from different individual principal teachers each time. This was the pattern seen within the transcript data. Where a code was generated by a principal teacher several times in response to a question, it was found from the raw transcript data to be a different individual each time.

The codes which were derived deductively, are represented by capital letters. Those which were inductively generated are represented by capital letters followed by a * symbol. It was assumed that the greater the number of new codes representing performance, authentic or integrated practice generated in response to a particular question, the more that particular practice was evident within the interview and subsequently was regarded more of a priority by the respondent.

As mentioned previously, the intention here was to try to perceive how examples of performance, authentic and integrated practice were evident within the principal

teacher interviews in both May and September of the school year, and to gain an insight as to the extent to which these practices impacted on the professionalism of principal teachers.

4.2 Table 1: May Responses to Question 1 - *"What would you say have been your priorities over the last working week?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
3	MPP	Management priorities, career review, QI's, DDP	5	MP	Management priorities, change, people	1	A*	Working with outside agencies
2	EX	Teaching to improve external exam results	3	NC	Addressing needs of individual pupils			
2	PM	Evidence for S&Q report	1	C	Teaching relevant parts of curriculum			
1	AT	Attainment of year groups	1	TLT	Most time spent on L/T			
1	AN	Self evaluation completed once / year	1	PPP	Focus on personal, professional priorities			
1	PA	Focus on HGIOS / SDP priorities						

Percentage of total codes for Question 1 generated reflecting **performance practice** = 6 out of 12 (50%)

Percentage of total codes generated for Question 1 reflecting **authentic practice** = 5 out of 12 (42%)

Percentage of total codes for Question 1 reflecting **integrated practice** = 1 out of 12 (8%)

Performance practice was slightly more prevalent than authentic practice within the responses to this question, and focused primarily on the management priorities of departmental staff career review, development planning and the use of quality indicators (HGIOS) for the purpose of self evaluation.

Principal teacher D commented,

"At this time of year, I am trying to put more objectivity into development planning, so that I can rationalise my thoughts...focus comes at this time of year to actually get things documented."

The teaching of pupils to improve external examination results, and the collation of evidence to support the production of a departmental Standards and Quality report were also priorities at this time.

Authentic practice was slightly less prevalent during May amongst principal teachers. The tasks occupying the majority of principal teacher's time were 'authentic' management priorities, which focused on the management of people, and the management of change. Effective management of the curriculum, learning and teaching, resources and the departmental budget were also a priority amongst principal teachers at this time within the school year.

Principal teacher B commented,

"Its all planning for next year..because if I don't know the accommodation situation, financial demands and timetable..all these things are major issues."

This is an example of authentic practice, where the priority of principal teacher B is planning accommodation, budget and timetable in order to provide the best learning experience for all pupils within the department. They are 'major issues' to this principal teacher in terms of learning and teaching. Development planning on the other hand, is more strategic than operational, planning for the future within a framework of accountability.

Only one reference was made to integrated practice at this time of the year, involving outside agencies such as the social work department, in meeting the needs of individual pupils.

The greatest number of codes generated within question 1, were those reflecting performance practice (6 out of 12 codes), indicating that this type of practice was referred to by principal teachers most frequently throughout the interviews. Although in practice, principal teachers were involved primarily with authentic tasks, (5 out of 12 codes). This means that although principal teachers were mainly involved with authentic tasks, their utterances in terms of codes generated, indicated that they were perhaps thinking in terms of performance.

Table 2: May Responses to Question 2 - *"Would you say these priorities are fairly typical for this time of year? If not, how are they different and why?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
3	PA	Priority areas of HGIOS / SDP	5	MP	Management priorities of people, change, curriculum, resources, budget	1	LT	Changing L&T according to context
2	CR	Teaching curriculum to satisfy self evaluation needs	5	NC	Addressing needs of individual pupils			
1	MPP	Management priorities career review, DDP / QI's	1	PPP	Focus on personal professional priorities			
1	PM	Evidence required for S&Q report						
1	EX	Teaching to improve external exam results						

Percentage of total codes generated for question 2 reflecting **performance practice = 5 out of 9 (56%)**

Percentage of total codes generated for question 2 reflecting **authentic practice =** 3 out of 9 (33%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 2 reflecting **integrated practice** = 1 out of 9 (11%)

A similar pattern emerged in question 2 to that of question 1. Principal teachers were concerned mainly with authentic tasks at this time of the school year, such as the management of people, change, budget and resources together with addressing the needs of individual pupils. However, the greatest number of codes generated (56%), were for performance practice, indicating that this was referred to most frequently by principal teachers during the interviews. Again, this is an indication that although principal teachers were involved mainly with authentic tasks, they were perhaps interpreting these in terms of performance, indicated by the number of performance codes generated from utterances during the interviews.

Performance practices by principal teachers at this time, focused mainly on the priorities of self evaluation (HGIOS), and the school development plan, together with teaching the curriculum in order to satisfy the requirements of self evaluation in order to achieve the highest level of excellence possible.

Integrated practice was referred to by only one principal teacher, regarding changing learning and teaching according to context. This could be interpreted as changing learning and teaching to satisfy performance requirements, or enhance authentic practice through addressing individual pupil needs.

Table 3: May Responses to Question 3 - *"What does the term 'quality assurance' mean to you?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
3	MPP	Management priorities career review, DDP, QI's	1	TLT	Majority of time spent on L&T	4	AC	Accountability for practice
3	QI	Select L&T methods that result in high QI rating	1	NC	Addressing needs of individual pupils			
2	PM	Evidence required to support S&Q report						
1	CR	Teaching curriculum to satisfy self evaluation						
1	EX	Teaching to improve external exam results						
1	AN	Self evaluation completed once / year						
1	PA	Priority areas of HGIOS / SDP						

Percentage of total codes generated for question 3 reflecting **performance practice**

= 7 out of 10 (70%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 3 reflecting **authentic practice**

= 2 out of 10 (20%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 3 reflecting **integrated practice**

= 1 out of 10 (10%)

The greatest number of codes generated for this question were for performance practice, indicating that this type of professional practice was most frequently referred to during the interviews. The codes generated for authentic and integrated practice were significantly fewer, indicating that these forms of professional practice were referred to less frequently when describing the meaning of 'quality assurance'.

The evidence suggests that at this time of the school year, the term 'quality assurance' is perceived to mean 'accountability for practice' by four principal teachers. 'Accountability for practice' could be interpreted as accountability for either performance *or* authentic practice, and was therefore classified as integrated practice, illustrated by the comment from principal teacher C,

"There seems to be far more quality assurance nowadays, and that's bound up with the need to be accountable."

Performance priorities included career review, development planning and self evaluation procedures, together with the selection of those learning and teaching methods which would result in a higher rating according to the six point scale in the HMIE document "HGIOS 3".

Integrated practice generated the lowest number of codes in response to this question, with four principal teachers responding. Authentic practice generated two codes, but with only two principal teachers responding, who referred specifically to learning and teaching and the needs of individual pupils as priorities. Principal teacher B commented,

"Quality assurance to me within our department, means the service we are delivering to pupils..to what extent we are addressing their needs, and how we deliver it."

Table 4: May Responses to Question 4 - *"Taking one mechanism of quality assurance such as self-evaluation, can you give one way in which it's use has affected learning and teaching together with management of your department?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
4	QI	L&T methods resulting in high QI rating	1	MP	Management priorities, people, change, resources, budget
2	EX	Teaching to improve external exam results	1	NC	Addressing needs of individual pupils
2	MPP	Management prioities, career review, DDP, QI's			
1	PA	Priorities of HGIOS / SDP			
1	AT	Attainment of year groups			
1	PM	Evidence for S&Q report			

Percentage of total codes generated for question 4 reflecting **performance practice** = 6 out of 8 (75%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 4 reflecting **authentic practice** = 2 out of 8 (25%)

No codes were generated for question 4 reflecting **integrated practice.**

Performance practice was represented by the response from the majority of principal teachers, indicating that they were selecting those learning and teaching approaches which resulted in a higher rating using quality indicators. This was done in order to satisfy the requirements of the self evaluation process. Principal teacher C observed,

"We have looked at how we can support S3 in different ways and improve their performance. So we are looking at being more selective....at the same time using a bit of AiFL, and the support for pupils department, to enable pupils to get the best out of the subject."

There was also some emphasis on teaching to improve external examination results, together with the performance management priorities of career review, and development planning. Teaching to improve external exam results was illustrated by principal teacher D, who when referring to a particular course in S5 stated,

" It has a hugely increased ICT content, so its getting the teacher up to speed with the extra content, and the pupils able to work at a good production rate with the extra in depth knowledge. They also do extra back up materials for practice, to encourage the pupils. It is'nt just what they do in class time, the teacher is now getting them to come in and do extra practice work, and the teacher has improved the exam results last year due to these measures that have been put in ."

Authentic practice was represented by the responses from only two principal teachers, indicating that self evaluation practices had impacted to a lesser extent on the management of people, change, resources and budget, together with meeting the needs of individual pupils.

The considerably larger number of codes generated for performance practice rather than authentic practice, indicates that principal teachers responded using a wider range of performance practice statements during the interview process. The lack of integrated codes suggests that principal teachers responses to question 4 were polarised between performance and authentic practices, resulting in distinct, unambiguous responses.

Table 5: May Responses to Question 5 - *"What do you see as being the main purpose of the departmental development plan? How does this relate to the school development plan and those of other departments?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
5	H*	Hierarchal structure of HT / DH / PT	3	h*	Accountability to pupils, parents, myself
			1	MP	Management priorities of people, change, resources, budget

Percentage of total codes generated for question 5 reflecting **performance practice** = 1 out of 3 (33%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 5 reflecting **authentic practice** = 2 out of 3 (67%)

No codes were generated for question 5 reflecting **integrated practice**

All five principal teachers referred to the main purpose of the departmental development plan, and its relationship to the school development plan, in terms of performance practice. It was seen primarily as a mechanism which reinforces the hierarchal structure of accountability within the school. This is illustrated by the comment from principal teacher A,

"The cynical side of me says it's a paper exercise, and I think that would be a view a number of PTs in the school share. On the other hand...the development plan gives you a goal to work for, and if it is set out correctly...then you can tell whether you have carried that out."

The departmental development plan was also described by four out of five principal teachers, in terms of authentic practice. It was referred to as a mechanism for accountability to pupils, parents and the principal teacher personally. The departmental development plan was also a vehicle for managing people and change within the department, together with allocation of resources, distribution of budget and development of the curriculum.

There were no responses from principal teachers representing integrated practice, suggesting perhaps that development planning was most easily described in terms of either performance or authentic practices.

The small number of codes generated by question 5, one for performance practice and two for authentic practice, might indicate that principal teachers are generally in agreement regarding the purpose of development planning within the school.

Table 6: May Responses to Question 6 - *"How does the production of a departmental development plan affect learning and teaching, management of your department and your own professional practice?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
5	PA	Priorities HGIOS / SDP	5	PPP	Focus on professional priorities	1	LT	Change L&T according to context
4	G*	Government initiative	4	MP	Management priorities people, change, resources, budget			
3	MPP	Management priorities career review, DDP, QIs	1	C	Teaching only relevant parts of curriculum			
3	NSD*	DP not influenced by SDP	1	SE	Self evaluation not continuous			
3	PM	Evidence for S&Q report	1	TLT	Priority learning and teaching			
2	CR	Teaching to satisfy self evaluation requirements						
1	AC*	Accountability for practice						

Percentage of total codes generated for question 6 reflecting **performance practice**

= 7 out of 13 (54%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 6 reflecting **authentic practice**

= 5 out of 13 (39%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 6 reflecting **integrated practice**

= 1 out of 13 (7%)

The majority of responses generated by principal teachers for question 6 were those reflecting performance practice. All five principal teachers indicated that the production of a department development plan was necessary in order to address the priorities set down in "HGIOS 3", and the school development plan. This was supported by four out of five principal teachers who responded that the need for a development plan was in response to a government initiative.

Principal teacher responses indicated that the department development plan was not influenced by the school development plan, but itself influenced departmental procedures such as career review, self evaluation and the provision of evidence for standards and quality reports.

Authentic practice was referred to in response to question 6, by all five principal teachers who indicated that the production of a department development plan allowed them to opportunity to focus on personal, professional priorities. Four out of five principal teachers stated that the departmental development planning process led to a focus on management priorities such as the management of people, change, resources and budget. There appeared to be more emphasis on this type of authentic management, rather than the performance management practices of career review and self evaluation, as indicated by the responses of four principal teachers for the former and three principal teachers for the latter.

Integrated practice was represented by the response from one principal teacher who suggested that the development plan might influence the delivery of learning and teaching according to context. However, the 'context' could be viewed in terms of either performance or authentic practice.

This question generated the largest number of codes reflecting performance practice, and indeed generated three new codes as indicated by the * symbol. This indicates that principal teachers responded more in terms of performance practice, when answering this question, rather than authentic or integrated practice. However, the perception of principal teachers appeared to be, according to the interview data, that the department development plan could fulfil a number of purposes, not always related directly to performance.

Table 7: May Responses to Question 7 - *"How useful is STACS data in development planning?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
2	PA	Focus of priority areas of HGIOS / SDP	3	PPP	Focus on personal, professional priorities	1	ID*	Use of internal assessment data
2	AT	Attainment of year groups	3	MP	Management priorities people, change, resources, budget			
2	QI	Selection of L&T methods resulting in higher self evaluation rating	1	NC	Addressing needs of individual pupils			
1	MPP	Management priorities career review, DDP, QI's						

Percentage of total codes generated for question 7 reflecting **performance practice**

= 4 out of 8 (50%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 7 reflecting **authentic practice**

= 3 out of 8 (38%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 7 reflecting **integrated practice**

= 1 out of 8 (12%)

Performance practices referred to in this question by principal teachers included focusing on the priority areas of the document "HGIOS 3" and the school development plan. Also, the attainment of year group cohorts, and the selection of those learning and teaching methods which were more likely to achieve a higher rating on the self evaluation six point scale as presented in "HGIOS 3".

In referring to the STACS data, principal teacher D commented,

"You just tend to look at it at a particular time of year...evaluate it, make adjustments, and it goes on the shelf..."

There was greater agreement amongst principal teachers regarding the influence of STACS data on authentic practice. Three out of five principal teachers commented on the value of STACS data in development planning in providing a focus on personal, professional priorities together with the management of people and change, within the department.

Integrated practice was represented by one principal teacher who commented upon the use of internal assessment data. This could be interpreted as performance practice, if assessment data was used to improve attainment in external examinations, or authentic practice if assessment data was used to address the learning needs of individual pupils.

One more code was generated during the interview with principal teachers for performance practice compared to authentic practice, indicating perhaps that principal teachers regarded the usefulness of STACS data in terms of performance practice. However, it is of interest that principal teachers indicated that STACS data was also regarded in terms of authentic practice, useful for identifying professional priorities, together with the management of people, and change within the department.

One new code was generated for integrated practice regarding the use of internal assessment data.

Table 8: May Responses to Question 8 - *"To whom are you accountable?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
5	AT	Attainment of year groups	5	ED*	Limited use of external data	1	AC*	Accountability for practice
2	AN	Self evaluation completed once / year	3	NC	Addressing needs of individual pupils			
2	S*	Difficulty of STACS format						
2	EX	Teaching to improve external exam results						
2	PM	Evidence for S&Q report						
1	CR	Teaching curriculum to satisfy self evaluation needs						
1	PA	Priorities of HGIOS and SDP						

Percentage of total codes generated for question 8 reflecting **performance practice**

= 8 out of 10 (80%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 8 reflecting **authentic practice**

= 2 out of 10 (20%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 8 reflecting **integrated practice**

= 1 out of 10 (10%)

Performance practice was most prevalent in response to this question, where all five principal teachers felt that they were accountable for the attainment of year groups to the head teacher. This is illustrated by the observation of principal teacher B that,

"... there is this huge need for accountability, which I think I have various feelings about. We can look at from the practical angle of the need to prove that we are performing well, and have the drive to improve performance to benefit children..."

However, individual pupil attainment as opposed to the attainment of year groups, was regarded by principal teachers in terms of authentic practice. Other responses reinforced accountability through performance procedures such as self evaluation, compliance with the school development plan, and analysis of STACS data.

Authentic practice was represented by all five principal teachers who were in agreement, that the analysis of external examination data was of little use in accountability for learning and teaching. Three out of five principal teachers felt that accountability to pupils, through the recognition of individual needs, was important. This is illustrated by the comment from principal teacher A,

"We do look at the pupils with whom we have input and see what they have achieved. But... you can't have a baseline because they are all so very different. It becomes quite difficult to statistically analyse. The other thing is the things you cannot measure like ethos, you can ask questions but you really can't measure the ethos."

One code was generated as an example of integrated practice, suggesting perhaps that principal teachers have distinct views regarding accountability which may be generally classified as either performance or authentic practice.

The greatest number of codes generated for question 8 were those of performance practice, indicating perhaps that principal teachers regard 'accountability' mainly in terms of performance. A significantly smaller number of codes were generated for authentic practice, with none appearing for integrated practice.

4.3 Summary of May Responses

The responses of principal teachers to the eight interview questions in May of the school year reflected primarily performance practice. The greatest number of codes was generated for performance practice, reflecting perhaps the significant impact of performativity on professional practice, through the wide range of dimensions relating to performance which were articulated during the interviews. In May of the school year, the performance priorities of principal teachers were departmental development planning, career review, and self evaluation using HGIOS 3.

All five principal teachers felt that the term 'quality assurance' meant accountability through the hierarchal model of management, for their own professional practice. This was classified as integrated practice. Professional accountability could be interpreted as authentic practice if it referred to meeting pupil needs, or having a reflexive approach to learning and teaching. Equally, professional accountability could also be interpreted as performance practice if it referred to accountability for external exam results.

The question which asked principal teachers what they felt was the meaning of the term 'quality assurance', generated the greatest number of codes reflecting

performance practice. This indicates that principal teachers regarded 'quality assurance' as a mechanism of performance.

Departmental development planning was regarded by all five principal teachers, in terms of professional accountability for their performance through a hierarchal management structure. However, interview data revealed that principal teachers also perceived an authentic dimension to development planning, through which they were accountable to both pupils and parents for learning and teaching.

All principal teachers felt that development planning was necessary to address the priorities of HGIOS 3, and was directly influenced by the outcomes of staff career reviews and the process of self evaluation.

The codes generated revealed that some principal teachers felt development planning reflected authentic practice, by allowing them to focus on the management of people , change, resources and budget within their departments.

STACS data was regarded by principal teachers mainly in terms of performance practice, indicated by the large number of codes generated in response to this question. Principal teachers felt that they were accountable for the attainment of year groups to the head teacher.

However, there was greater agreement amongst principal teachers that the analysis of STACS data impacted on authentic practice, by allowing them to focus on personal professional priorities, together with the management of their departments. This agreement was apparent from the responses of all five principal teachers, which only generated two codes indicating perhaps a high level of agreement amongst participants.

The responses of the five principal teachers to the eight interview questions in September of the school year, will now be presented and discussed in the following section 4.5, through analysis of tables 9 – 16.

4.4 Table 9: September Responses to Question 1 - *"What would you say have been your priorities over the last working week?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
4	PM	Evidence for S&Q report	5	NC	Addressing needs of individual pupils	1	LT	Changing L&T according to context
1	EX	Teaching to improve exam results	3	MP	Management priorities people, change, budget, resources			
			1	D*	Discipline issues			

Percentage of total codes generated for question 1 reflecting **performance practice**

= 2 out of 6 (33%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 1 reflecting **authentic practice**

= 3 out of 6 (50%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 1 reflecting **integrated practice**

= 1 out of 6 (17%)

Authentic practice was represented by greater agreement between principal teachers, and generated more codes than performance practice in response to question 1. It

appeared to be a priority at this time of the academic year, irrespective of a whole school focus on the analysis of STACS data, and the production of departmental standards and quality reports. All five principal teachers felt that they were focusing at this time of the needs of individual pupils. Three out of five principal teachers were involved with the management of people, change, budget and resources.

Three out of five principal teachers responded that the management of people, change, budget and resources was a priority at this time, with one principal teacher mentioning discipline as a priority.

Performance practice was represented by four out of five principal teachers, who responded that at this time, their priority was finding evidence to support the production of a standards and quality report for their department, the deadline for which was the end of September. Principal teacher B stated that the priority at this time of the school year was,

"Standards and quality……..with the STACS I don't feel I use them as well as I could, because I have not been using them in the same way as other principal teachers."

One principal teacher indicated that her priority was teaching to improve exam results, perhaps influenced by the recent publication of STACS data for the school.

Integrated practice was represented by one principal teacher who indicated that teaching according to context was a priority, which could relate to either authentic or performance practices.

Table 10: September Responses to Question 2 - *"Would you say these priorities are fairly typical for this time of year? If not, how are they different and why?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
1	EX	Teaching to improve exam results	2	NC	Addressing needs of individual pupils
			2	MP	Management priorities people, change, resources, budget
			1	TS	Teaching to develop personal skills of pupils
			1	D*	Discipline issues

Percentage of total codes generated for question 2 reflecting **performance practice** = 1 out of 5 (20%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 2 reflecting **authentic practice** = 4 out of 5 (80%)

No codes were generated for question 2 reflecting **integrated practice**

Authentic practice was prevalent in response to question 2, with two out of five principal teachers citing the needs of pupils and the management of people, change as priorities at this time of the school year. Teaching to develop personal skills of pupils

such as social, and communication skills, was a priority for one principal teacher, with pupil discipline issues a priority for another.

Performance practice was referred to only by principal teacher C, who stated that teaching to improve exam results was a priority at this time of year, and continued,

"I am looking at the pace of learning for my pupils from a learning and teaching perspective, to maximise their learning and syllabus coverage for the prelims after Christmas. Also, we have to ensure we have covered enough syllabus for the assessments that we have to do with standard grade, and NABS for higher."

The greatest number of codes generated for question 2 related to authentic practice, indicating that principal teachers regarded their priorities at this time of the school year in terms of this approach. Only one code was generated for performance practice by one principal teacher, with no codes being generated for integrated practice.

Table 11: September Responses to Question 3 - *" What does the term 'quality assurance' mean to you?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
5	QD*	Quality assurance depends on other teachers / departments	2	MP	Management priorities people, change, resources, budget	2	TS	Teaching to develop personal skills of pupils
4	MPP	Management priorities career review, DDP, QI's				1	LT	Learning and teaching according to context
3	PM	Evidence for S&Q report						
2	QI	L&T methods resulting in high QI rating						
2	AT	Attainment of year groups						
1	QC*	Quality assurance procedures ongoing						
1	PT*	Performance of teachers						
1	H*	Hierarchy HT/DH/PT						
1	ID*	Use of internal assessment data						
1	QM*	Quality assurance has little meaning						

Percentage of total codes generated for question 3 reflecting **performance practice**

= 10 out of 13 (77%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 3 reflecting **authentic practice**

= 1 out of 13 (8%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 3 reflecting **integrated practice**

= 2 out of 13 (15%)

Performance practice was most prevalent in the responses by principal teachers to question 3. All five principal teachers stated that quality assurance depends upon other teachers and departments. The suggestion here is that quality assuring the standard of learning and teaching, depends upon the professional performance of teachers within a department. The standard of learning and teaching may also be affected by the activities of other departments, such as the removal of pupils from classes to attend rehearsals, outdoor activities and so on.

Four out of five principal teachers indicated that quality assurance meant the completion of procedures such as career review, development planning and self evaluation. Three out of five principal teachers suggested that quality assurance meant the collation of evidence for the departmental standards and quality report, required by the head teacher at the end of September.

Compliance with the demands of performance in terms of higher attainment was illustrated by two out of five principal teachers who stated that quality assurance to them meant selecting those learning and teaching methods which resulted in a higher self evaluation rating according the document "HGIOS 3".

Authentic practice was represented by two out of five principal teachers who responded that quality assurance meant focusing on management priorities such as the management of people, change, learning and teaching, budget and resources.
Integrated practice was represented by two principal teachers who felt that developing the personal skills of pupils, such as communication and social skills, was a priority. As this could apply to either performance or authentic practice, it was classified as an example of integrated practice, together with one response regarding learning and teaching according to context.

The greatest number of codes generated by question 3 was for performance practice, indicating the principal teachers thought of 'quality assurance' mainly in terms of the demands of performance. This perhaps is reinforced by the generation of only one code for authentic practice in response to this question. Two codes were generated for integrated practice, with two principal teachers prioritising the development of pupil's personal skills, which might be interpreted as an example of either performance or authentic practice. Personal skills could mean examination skills perhaps, or skills in working with others.

Table 12: September Responses to Question 4 - ***"Taking one mechanism of quality assurance such as self evaluation, can you give an example of one way in which it's use has affected learning and teaching, together with the management of your department?"***

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
3	IQI*	QI's not useful in development planning	4	PPP	Focus on personal, professional priorities
2	QI	Select L&T methods resulting in higher QI rating	3	NC	Addressing needs of individual pupils
1	PA	Priority areas of SDP/HGIOS	1	MP	Priority managing people, change, resources, budget
1	EV*	Use of internal/external assessment data	1	SE	Self evaluation not continuous throughout the year
1	EX	Teaching to improve exam results			

Percentage of total codes generated for question 4 reflecting **performance practice** = 5 out of 9 (55%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 4 reflecting **authentic practice** = 4 out of 9 (45%)

No codes were generated for **integrated practice.**

Performance practice was reflected in the slightly greater number of codes generated by principal teachers, compared to those generated for authentic practice. Three out of five principal teachers felt that self evaluation using the quality indicators presented in "HGIOS 3", did not usefully inform departmental development planning. This is illustrated by principal teacher A who commented,

"A teacher has improved results last year due to the measures he put in. Using QI's pointed up what we are not terribly good at. We have to improve..but we knew that anyway."

Three principal teachers commented that QI's were not useful during the process of development planning.

Focus on the priority of areas of "HGIOS 3" and the school development plan, together with the use of assessment data were also mentioned by one different principal teacher respectively.

Authentic practice responses showed four out of five principal teachers commenting that a mechanism of quality assurance such as self evaluation helped them to identify personal, professional priorities. Three out of five principal teachers indicated that this mechanism allowed them to identify the learning needs of individual pupils. One principal teacher mentioned that self evaluation was not continuous throughout the year, and another that the management of people, change resources and budget were a priority.

There were no responses reflecting integrated practice.

The number of codes generated for performance practice in response to this question was greater by one than those for authentic practice, perhaps indicating that principal teachers did not strongly regard the practice of self evaluation only in terms of

performativity. Responses were made referring clearly to either performance or authentic practice, resulting in no codes being generated for integrated practice

Table 13: September Responses to Question 5 - *"What do you see as being the main purpose of the departmental development plan? How does it relate to the school development plan, and those of other departments?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
5	VDP*	Development plan useful	2	MP	Management priorities people, change, resources
4	SD*	Development plan influenced by SDP	1	NC	Addressing needs of pupils
3	SDP*	STACS data does not inform DDP			
3	MPP	Management priorities career review, DDP, QI's			
2	PM	Evidence for S&Q report			
2	PA	Priority areas of HGIOS/SDP			
2	CDP*	Format of development plan			
1	NSD*	Development plan not influenced by SDP			
1	EV*	Use of assessment data			
1	QC*	Quality assurance procedures ongoing			

Percentage of total codes generated for question 5 reflecting **performance practice** = 10 out of 12 (84%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 5 reflecting **authentic practice** = 2 out of 12 (16%)

No codes were generated for question 5 reflecting **integrated practice**

Performance practice was dominant in response to question 5, being referred to during the interviews in a significantly increased number of original ways, as indicated by the generation of new codes, denoted by a * symbol. All five principal teachers agreed that the development plan was a useful tool, with four principal teachers indicating that it was influenced by the school development plan.

Principal teacher D commented,

"We are working on our development plan all year. I may well write my development plan at a particular time of year, but I have firmed up in my head the areas that I see, as the year goes on."

Three out of five principal teachers felt that STACS data had no influence on their development plan, and that the process of development planning helped them to focus on performance management tasks such as career review, and self evaluation.

Authentic practice was referred to by two principal teachers, who felt that development planning allowed them to focus on the management of people, change, budget and resources. One principal teacher referred the development planning allowing pupils learning needs to be addressed.

There were no responses that were able to be classified as examples of integrated practice.

Performance practice generated significantly more codes than authentic practice in response to this question, indicating that performance practice was a priority to all five principal teachers at this time.

Table 14: September Responses to Question 6 - *"How does the production of a department development plan affect learning and teaching, the management of your department, and your own professional practice?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
2	PA	Priority areas of HGIOS/SDP	3	SE	Self evaluation not continuous throughout the year
2	VDP*	Development plan very useful	2	NC	Addressing pupils learning needs
			1	MP	Management of people, change, resources, budget
			1	TS	Teaching personal pupil skills

Percentage of total codes generated for question 6 reflecting **performance practice** = 2 out of 6 (34%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 6 reflecting **authentic practice** = 4 out of 6 (66%)

No codes were generated for question 6 reflecting **integrated practice**

Authentic practice was prevalent in response to this question regarding the effects of development planning. Three out of five principal teachers responded that self evaluation which informed the development plan, was not continuous throughout the year. Addressing the learning needs of pupils together with the teaching of personal skills such as working with others, was also seen as a function of the development planning process.

Performance practice was referred to by two out of five principal teachers who commented that development planning allowed them to focus on the priority areas of HGIOS and the school development plan. Two different principal teachers commented that they found the development plan a useful tool in the management of their departments.

The greatest number of codes generated for this question reflected authentic practice, perhaps suggesting that principal teachers think of development planning in terms of pupil and staff needs. This reinforces the findings in May, that principal teachers view development planning from both a performance and authentic dimension. The responses to this question revealed, that it was the *authentic* dimension of development planning at this time of the school year which was dominant.

Performance practice was represented by only two codes, which might indicate perhaps a resistance to the performative demands of development planning.

Table 15: September Responses to Question 7 - *"How useful is STACS data in development planning?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
5	SDP*	STACS data does not inform DDP	5	IP*	Focus on individual pupil progress	5	MDU	Individual pupil data useful
5	VDP*	Development plan very useful	3	NIP*	Individual pupil progress limited	4	NCC*	Needs of individual not addressed
2	NSD*	DDP not influenced by SDP	1	NC	Addressing pupil learning needs			
1	EV*	Assessment data useful	1	CP*	Curriculum does not meet pupil needs			
			1	SE	Self evaluation not continuous			

Percentage of total codes generated for question 7 reflecting **performance practice** = 4 out of 11 (37%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 7 reflecting **authentic practice** = 5 out of 11 (45%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 7 reflecting **integrated practice** = 2 out of 11 (18%)

Authentic practice was slightly more prevalent in response to question 7, with the generation of one more code. All five principal teachers responded that STACS data

helped them to focus on the academic progress of individual pupils. However, three out of five principal teachers commented that this progress was limited, referring to a 'glass ceiling' beyond which individual pupils cannot advance, irrespective of the efforts of teachers. These principal teachers felt that every child has a limited capacity for learning, beyond which knowledge cannot be gained, no matter how creative teachers are within their pedagogical approach.

One respondent commented that the current curriculum did not meet pupils needs, and another that self evaluation as a result of STACS data analysis was not continuous throughout the year.

Performance practice responses indicated that all five principal teachers felt that STACS data was not useful in informing the departmental development plan, however this in itself as a management tool was very useful.

Principal teacher D commented,

"I know the more variables you have, the more invalid your statistic will be…..the probability level drops dramatically. Basically, I have to 'cow tow' to what the 'high heid yins' say……I dutifully fill in the forms and talk to my faculty head. We have a good discussion about STACS data, but at the end of the day, it makes no difference to what will happen in terms of results the following year……."

Two respondents commented that the school development plan did not influence their department development plans. One respondent found internal and external assessment data useful in tracking pupil progress.

Integrated practice responses revealed that all five principal teachers felt that individual pupil data was useful. This could be interpreted as personal profile data,

evidence of class work or internal/external assessment data, together with MiDYIS ability scores. There is perhaps an implication that this data is not being used effectively, as four out of five principal teachers commented that the needs of individual pupils were not being addressed.

This question generated a total of eight new codes out of eleven, perhaps indicating that principal teachers were articulating an increased number of dimensions of the effects of STACS on development planning, compared to the May data where only one new code was generated. Principal teachers may have been giving more thought to the impact of STACS data at this time of the school year, as September is the time when the data is made available to schools.

Table 16: September Responses to Question 8 - *"To whom are you accountable?"*

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of PTs	Code	Meaning of Code
5	H*	Hierarchal structure HT/DH/PT	5	P*	Accountability to parents	1	AD	Accountable to other departments
2	MPP	Management priorities career review, DDP, QI's	3	h*	Accountability to parents/pupils/myself	1	AC*	Accountability for practice
1	CR	Teaching curriculum to satisfy self evaluation demands	2	ACL*	Accountability to colleagues			
			1	A*	Accountability to outside agencies			
			1	AA*	Accountability erodes autonomy			

Percentage of total codes generated for question 8 reflecting **performance practice** = 4 out of 10 (40%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 8 reflecting **authentic practice** = 5 out of 10 (50%)

Percentage of total codes generated for question 8 reflecting **integrated practice** = 1 out of 10 (10%)

Authentic practice was slightly more prevalent than performance practice within the principal teacher responses to question 8. All five principal teachers agreed that they were accountable to parents. Three out of five principal teachers felt that together with parents, they were accountable to both pupils and themselves. Two respondents felt they were accountable to colleagues, with one respondent commenting that they felt accountable to outside agencies, such as the social work department. Another stated that accountability erodes autonomy.

Performance practice revealed that all five principal teachers felt that they were accountable to their faculty head, and the head teacher within the formal hierarchal management structure of the school. Two principal teachers interpreted the question as being accountable for performance procedures such as the construction of the department development plan and self evaluation procedures. One respondent felt accountable for their own professional practice, while another commented that they were accountable for teaching the curriculum in order to satisfy the demands of self evaluation.

Integrated practice was represented by one respondent who felt that they were accountable to other departments within the school, for their professional practice. Principal teacher B stated,

"I'm accountable to every other department in the school. We are also accountable to parents and the education authority. We have social workers coming in .....and we have to explain and justify to them what we are doing."

The greatest number of codes generated for this question reflected authentic practice. Each one of the five codes was a new code (denoted by a * symbol) which had been formed in order to classify a unique response. This perhaps indicates that principal teachers were thinking more deeply about accountability issues at this time of the school year, and articulating more varied responses to the question.

Performance practice responses generated five codes of which two were new, again perhaps illustrating the importance of this question to principal teachers.

4.5 Commentary on the Head Teacher Question Response Table 17

The head teacher was asked the eight questions previously presented to the principal teachers, during one interview in May 2007.

The head teacher response tables indicate in column one, the number of times the head teacher responded within a particular code during the interview. Columns two and three contain the appropriate code letters and meanings respectively. The number of codes out of the total number generated for each category of performance,

authentic and integrated practice, is given and the foot of each table and expressed as a percentage of the total number of codes generated for the question.

The head teacher kindly agreed to being interviewed on one occasion only. In order to generate as much data as possible from the interview, the number of utterances of each code was recorded. This was a different approach from that used with the principal teachers, as only one individual was being interviewed, as opposed to five individuals. A comparative approach was therefore not practical in this instance.

The intention was that this information might provide an insight into how performance, authentic and integrated practices impacted on the professional practice of the head teacher. The intention was also to find any commonalities, and differences between the responses of the head teacher and those of principal teachers.

4.5.1 Table 17: Head Teacher Response Frequencies – May Interview

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice		
No. of Responses	Code	Meaning of Code	No. of Responses	Code	Meaning of Code
11	PPT*	Performance management of PTs using STACS evidence	4	AU*	Importance of autonomy of school, depts. PTs
10	QA*	Quality assurance purpose/role	3	DLT	Development of L&T
9	CM*	Change management	3	AL*	Development of AiFL
9	EP*	Evaluation procedures L&T	2	PR	Need for personal professional reflection
7	HA*	Hierarchal accountability of PTs			
7	SUM*	Analysis of STACS/MiDYIs data			
5	SEY	Self evaluation ongoing throughout year			
5	EXC*	Pursuit of excellence			
4	DPT	Priority career reviews, DDP, S&Q reports			
4	SA*	Systematic approach to quality assurance			
4	OM*	Organisational management			
3	NLP*	National/local priorities			
2	HGU*	HGIOS useful			
2	OT*	Focus on attainment outcomes			
1	SDP	Production/review of SDP			

Percentage of total codes generated for all eight questions during the interview of head teacher reflecting **performance practice** = 15 out of 19 (79%)

Percentage of total codes generated for all eight questions during the interview of the head teacher reflecting **authentic practice** = 4 out of 19 (21%)

No codes were generated reflecting **integrated practice**

Performance practice was a priority of the head teacher, according to the response frequency evidence, both in terms of the number of codes generated and, the number of comments made relating to each code. Throughout the interview, the head teacher referred most frequently to the need of holding principal teachers to account through external examination results (STACS data), and subsequently attempting where appropriate, to improve their professional performance which generated eleven responses. The head teacher remarked, referring to principal teachers within the school,

"They are not accountable enough, they should be more accountable..."

He continued...

" But never the less, it's clear in my mind that the principal teacher is a leader and a manager within their Department. As such, they've got to be able to demonstrate leadership and management (to the head teacher), and one of the parts of that is Quality Assurance and self-evaluation within the Department, that's the key role in many ways of the principal teacher."

The purpose and role of quality assurance procedures, such as self evaluation and career review in improving the professional practice of both principal teachers and class teachers, was also referred to throughout the interview generating ten responses.

Emphasis was placed upon the need for principal teachers to be able to carry out self evaluation effectively within their departments. The head teacher commented,

"Self evaluation to me is a systematic way of determining how well we're doing……..I think there are any number of ways principal teachers can demonstrate that self evaluation is having an effect."

Evaluation of learning and teaching methods, and subsequent management of change in order to bring about improvement, was also a main priority of the head teacher, generating nine responses during the interview.

Slightly less emphasis was placed during the interview on the accountability of principal teachers within the hierarchal structure, and the analysis of both STACS and MiDYiS data with seven responses each.

The need for self evaluation to be ongoing throughout the year within departments, together with the 'pursuit of excellence', generated five responses each.

Referred to on only four occasions throughout the interview, were the importance of departmental career reviews of staff by principal teachers, the production of the development plan, together with a standards and quality report for each department. Also the need for a systematic approach to quality assurance, together with effective organisational management.

The importance of national and local educational priorities was mentioned three times during the interview, with the usefulness of HGIOS 3 and the need to focus on attainment outcomes mentioned twice.

The production and review of the school development plan was referred to once during the interview.

Authentic practice was represented to a lesser extent within the responses of the head teacher to the eight interview questions. On four occasions, the importance of autonomy to the school, departments and principal teachers in allowing the school to progress through a creative approach was mentioned. The need to develop learning and teaching methods, together with the successful implementation of the Assessment is for Learning initiative, generated three responses. Finally, the need for principal teachers to reflect on their own professional practice in order to improve generated two responses during the interview.

The majority of responses from the head teacher reflected performance practice (79%), with a significantly lower number reflecting authentic practice (21%). There were no responses which could be classified as integrated practice. The interview with the head teacher generated fourteen new codes, twelve of which were for performance practice. This perhaps indicates the importance of performativity to the head teacher, as revealed in the number of different ways in which views regarding performance practices within the school were articulated. The majority of codes generated during the interviews with principal teachers also reflected performance practice, perhaps as a result of the head teachers expectations within the hierarchal management structure. However, perhaps unlike the head teacher, principal teachers were able to realise a more authentic dimension to performativity.

4.6 Interrogation of Senior Management Team Minutes May 2007 – 2008

Following the weekly meeting of the senior management team within the case study school, an electronic copy of the minutes is circulated to each principal teacher. These minutes were examined for each week between the beginning on May 2007 and the end of May 2008. All information within the minutes was collated under seven emerging themes. These were, departmental development planning / school development plan 4.6.1 quality assurance 4.6.2, operational issues / administration 4.6.3, discipline 4.6.4, education management 4.6.5, national priorities 4.6.6, and expected themes which did not appear in the minutes 4.6.7. Each of these will be discussed in turn in the following section.

It is recognized however, that the senior management team minutes gave only one limited perspective of the focus of discussions, and that many informal discussion may have taken place regarding themes of learning and teaching for example, which may not have appeared on the minutes which formed the source of secondary data.

4.6.1 Departmental Development Planning / School Development Plan.

Development planning appeared within the weekly senior management team minutes in February, May and June of the school academic year. This coincided with the interim audit of both departmental and school development plans, which takes place in February each year. The focus of this audit is the progress made in meeting targets specified within the development plans. May and June are the months in which the education authority expects submission of development plans from all departments

and the head teacher for the following academic year. It may be inferred then, that the appearance of development planning for discussion by the senior management team was perhaps due to procedural obligations.

4.6.2 Quality Assurance

Quality assurance appeared as a topic for discussion at times throughout the school year, with a significant influence in February. There was however, no appearance of quality assurance within the senior management team minutes in May or June, when development planning was the main item of discussion.

February may have been the month in which quality assurance issues were discussed most frequently, as at this time the senior management team met with the director of education and the quality improvement officer in the local authority, to discuss quality assurance issues within the school. This was also the time when principal teachers were analyzing prelim results and comparing this with predicted pupil scores on the Midyis system. Class observations were also carried out by members of the senior management team at this time.

Quality assurance discussions at times throughout the school year included topics such as attainment in external exams, access to supported study, the implementation of the homework policy, and the formulation of 'action points' to be addressed in the immediate future. These action points addressed in particular the levels of expectation of both pupil and staff performance, together with the attainment of boys in S4 and S5.

4.6.3 Operational Issues and Administration

Operational and administrative issues were the dominant topics of discussion which appeared within every senior management team meeting throughout the year. These operational issues included for example, timetabling, staffing, dress code, budget, school maintenance and school calendar dates. The discussion of these topics was ongoing throughout the year, and appeared most frequently within the senior management team minutes.

4.6.4 Discipline

Discussion topics relating to discipline issues appeared each month within the senior management team minutes throughout the year. These related to both staff and pupil discipline. Specific details of staff discipline issues were not recorded in the minutes, but appeared simply as a generic topic for discussion. These could have referred items such as staff absence, and professional performance.

Details of pupil discipline issues were not recorded in the minutes, only the names of pupils under discussion appeared. These were referred to in the minutes as "high tariff" pupils, and involved mainly pupils in S1 and S2. Discussion would involve for example disruptive behaviour in class, verbal abuse of staff and other pupils, refusal to follow instructions and so on.

4.6.5 Education Management

Education management discussion topics involved the management of people, change and resources. Over the course of one year, this appeared specifically within the senior management team minutes on five occasions. The first involved discussion on budget allocation and a CPD seminar on "professionalism". The second and third occasions involved the topics of senior management team year group responsibilities, and review of the school management structure respectively. The latter focused primarily on the combination of subject areas to reduce the number of principal teachers within the school. The fourth occasion on which educational management issues were discussed involved the re-organisation of the school development group, and it's role in the building of the new school, due to open in 2014. The final discussion of educational management issues focused on the content of the education authority head teacher's meeting.

4.6.6 National Priorities

Discussions of the national priorities within Scottish education appeared each month within the senior management team minutes in the year 2007-08. These focused mainly on "Curriculum for Excellence", "Assessment is for Learning" (AiFL) and "Schools of Ambition".

Curriculum for Excellence involved discussions on the new learning outcomes and how these might be reported to parents. Funding bids were also considered, together with the proposal for an S1 / S2 Curricular Theme Week in the summer term.

Progress in each department's use of AiFL techniques were discussed, together with a review of school targets within this national priority.

The schools within the education authority of the case study school had received funding from the Scottish Government to become "Schools of Ambition." This involved developing leadership skills amongst pupils, and improving curricular links between schools through extended ICT provision. Progress of this initiative was discussed throughout the year each month within the senior management team meetings.

4.6.7 Themes Which Were Absent from the Senior Management Team Minutes 2007 – 08.

The focus of this research is the effect of performance management on the professional practice of principal teachers, and ultimately the quality of learning and teaching within the case study school. It is interesting to note however, that learning and teaching, and self-evaluation did not appear as items for discussion within the senior management team minutes. Other themes which might have been expected to appear for discussion relating to performance management were aspects of policy, whole school analysis of STACS data, school board issues, and the influence of the quality improvement officer. However, these themes did not appear in the minutes.

4.7 Summary

Within the following summary, commonalities and differences between the codes generated by principal teacher responses to each of the eight interview questions in

turn are considered, in May and September of the school year. This is followed by a final summary of the principal teacher responses in section 4.7.1.

Finally, a summary of the responses of the head teacher to the eight interview questions are also considered, and compared to those of the five principal teachers in section 4.7.2.

Question 1 *" What would you say have been your priorities over the last working week?"*

In May of the school year, performance practice was dominant to either authentic or integrated practice. Six performance practice codes were generated in May, compared to two in September.

The May priorities covered a much wider area of performance practice, with the greatest emphasis being placed by three out of five principal teachers, on the performance management priorities of career review, self evaluation and department development planning.

Perhaps this outcome reflected the performance pressure that principal teachers are under at this time of year, to complete self evaluation and development planning documentation.

In September, four out of five principal teachers commented on the importance of producing the departmental standards and quality report, and one mentioned teaching to improve exam performance. Perhaps this might have reflected the need for principal teachers to complete and submit a standards and quality report for their departments at this time in the school year, together with the publication of STACS data, highlighting exam performance within departments.

There was less of a marked contrast in the number of codes relating to authentic practice, with five in May and three in September. Of particular interest is that all five principal teachers highlighted addressing the needs of individual pupils as a priority. This may have been as a result of the publication and analysis of STACS data at this time emphasising pupil attainment. Alternatively, principal teachers may have been influenced by the new intake of S1 pupils, where efforts are made to get to know the pupils and address their needs at this time of the school year.

Common to both May and September, according to the responses of principal teachers, were the performance practice of teaching to improve exam results, together with the authentic practice of managing people, change, budget and resources.

<u>Question 2</u> *" Would you say these priorities are fairly typical for this time of year? If not, how are they different and why?"*

Again, in May of the school year performance practice was clearly dominant to either authentic or integrated practice. Five codes were generated in May reflecting performance practice, compared to only one in September. Three out of five principal teachers highlighted self evaluation using HGIOS 3, and the demands of the school development plan as priorities in May. Two out of five principal teachers indicated that they were teaching the curriculum to satisfy the demands of self evaluation at this time. This may reflect the demands on principal teachers in May to complete self evaluation documentation for submission to the head teacher.

In September, authentic practice was dominant to either performance or integrated practice. Four codes were generated reflecting authentic practice, compared to three in

May. The management priorities of managing people, change, budget and resources, together with addressing the needs of individual pupils were priorities in both May and September. However, perhaps greater importance was placed on these dimensions of authentic practice in May, where all five principal teachers responded, compared to two out of five responding in September. This outcome might have been influenced by the allocation of departmental budgets, and the beginning of new classes at this time of the school year.

Discipline issues appeared as one code generated by one principal teacher in September, reflecting perhaps the settling in period required for new pupils in S1.
Only one code for performance practice was produced by one principal teacher in September, who emphasised the need to teach to improve exam results. It is surprising perhaps that the publication of STACS data at this time, did not appear to significantly influence principal teachers practice in terms of accountability for exam results.

Question 3 *" What does the term 'quality assurance' mean to you?"*

Performance practice was dominant to either authentic or integrated practice in both May and September. Principal teachers placed more emphasis however on performance practice in September, with ten codes being generated compared to seven in May.

Performance priorities in May, reflected in the responses of three out of five principal teachers, were those of career reviews, development planning and self evaluation. Again, this might have been as a result of the pressure on principal teachers to

produce documented evidence at this time of the school year, for submission to the head teacher.

In September, all five principal teachers responded that quality assurance depends upon other teachers and departments. This could be interpreted perhaps as principal teachers not wishing to be held personally accountable for quality assurance, but indicating that it is also the responsibility of others within the school.

The management priorities of career review, development planning and self evaluation were slightly more of a priority in September, where four principal teachers responded, than May where there was three responses. This could have been due perhaps to the process of discussion of career review outcomes, together with self evaluation and development planning documentation with faculty heads, which traditionally occurs in September.

Possibly, the influence of carrying out, and the subsequent discussion of self evaluation procedures, resulted in three principal teachers responding in May, and two in September, that they selected only those learning and teaching methods which resulted in a higher QI rating as part of the self evaluation procedure.

The production of evidence for the departmental standards and quality report was also a priority of principal teachers, with two responses in May and three in September. Attainment of year groups however, was only a performance priority in September with two principal teachers responding. This might have been as a result of the influence of the school STACS data perhaps.

Authentic practice was represented by the generation of two codes in May, and only one code in September. In May, one principal teacher commented that the majority of their time was spent on learning and teaching, whereas another felt that addressing the needs of individual pupils was a priority.

In September, only one code reflecting authentic practice was generated, where two principal teachers responded that the management of people, change, resources and budget was a priority at this time. This could have been due to the recent change in timetable, and the start of new cohorts in all courses in September.

Integrated practice was slightly more prevalent in September, represented by two codes, than in May where only one code was generated. Here however, four out of five principal teachers commented, that accountability for practice was a priority when considering the meaning of quality assurance. This could be interpreted in terms of performance as accountability for pupil attainment, or in terms of authentic practice as accountability for meeting pupil needs.

In September, two codes were generated for integrated practice, with two principal teachers prioritising teaching to develop the personal skills of pupils, and one prioritising learning and teaching according to context. If interpreted in terms of performance practice, this could mean developing the personal skills of pupils, and developing learning and teaching, only to improve performance in examinations.

However, if interpreted in terms of authentic practice, this could mean developing personal skills of pupils such as communication, group working and so on. Developing learning and teaching according to context, could refer to the context of individual pupil needs.

Question 4 *"Taking one mechanism of quality assurance such as self evaluation, can you give one way in which its use has affected learning and teaching, together with the management of your department?"*

Performance practice dominated the responses of principal teachers in both May and September, generating six codes and five codes respectively. There was greatest agreement amongst principal teachers in May, with four out of five responding that only those learning and teaching methods were selected that resulted in a higher QI rating.

In September, three out of five principal teachers commented that the use of QI's within the self evaluation process was not useful in development planning. This is worthy of note as the driving principle of self evaluation is that the outcomes are acted upon through the process of development planning. However, the interview data reveals this not to be the case, perhaps because principal teachers have a more procedural approach to performance practice, rather than perhaps a strategic approach.

There was a marked difference between the number of codes reflecting authentic practice in May and September. Two codes were generated in May, and four codes in September. In May, one principal teacher prioritised addressing the needs of individual pupils, and another the management priorities of people, change, resources and budget. These two codes also appeared reflecting authentic practice in September,

with addressing the needs of pupils being a greater priority at this time with three principal teachers responding, as opposed to one response in May.

In September, four out of five principal teachers indicated that a focus on personal professional priorities was a priority at this time. This agreement amongst principal teachers perhaps indicates the importance of this particular dimension of authentic practice to them at this time. Perhaps this outcome may have been influenced by principal teachers themselves being involved in career reviews with their faculty heads in September. This is also the time that applications to the school CPD committee for funding may be submitted.

<u>Question 5</u> *" What do you see as being the main purpose of the departmental development plan? How does this relate to the school development plan and those of other departments?"*

In May, authentic practice was dominant with two codes generated. Performance practice was represented by only one code, and no codes appeared to represent integrated practice.

However, a strikingly different picture emerged in September, where performance practice was clearly dominant represented by ten codes, as opposed to authentic practice which was represented again by two codes.

In May, there was agreement between all five principal teachers that the main purpose of the development plan was simply to reinforce the hierarchal structure of accountability within the school, reflecting performance practice.

The small number of codes generated by question 5 in May, particularly for performance practice, might indicate that principal teachers are generally in agreement regarding the purpose of development planning within the school.

The authentic practice of perceiving the development plan as a vehicle for managing people, change resources and budget within the department was common in both May and September. One principal teacher responded within this code in May, and two responded in September. This perhaps indicates that the development plan as a management tool, is an ongoing priority with principal teachers throughout the year.
In May, three principal teachers prioritised accountability to pupils, parents and themselves as being the main purpose of the development plan. This may have been due to the documentation being completed at this time, as this did not appear as a code in September. Instead, one principal teacher felt that addressing the needs of pupils was a priority in September.

The ten codes reflecting performance practice in September, perhaps indicates the many different interpretations principal teachers had regarding the main purpose of the development plan. All five principal teachers agreed that the development plan was a useful tool. Four out of five responded that the development plan was influenced by the school development plan, with three principal teachers revealing that STACS data does not inform their development plan.

There is a contradiction here however within the performance practice codes, with one principal teacher commenting that their development plan is *not* influenced by the school development plan, and a different individual indicating that the use of

assessment data *is* useful in development planning. This perhaps is a further evidence for principal teachers having very diverse interpretations of the development planning process within the case study school.

Management priorities of career review, development planning and self evaluation had slightly more importance compared to the authentic practice at this time of managing people, change, resources and budget, with three and two principal teachers responding respectively.

No codes were generated for integrated practice in May or September, suggesting perhaps that development planning was more easily described in terms of either performance or authentic practice.

<u>Question 6</u> *" How does the production of a departmental development plan affect learning and teaching, management of your department and your own professional practice?"*

The number of codes generated in response to this question, indicated that performance practice was more prevalent in May, and authentic practice more prevalent in September.

Performance practice was dominant in May with seven codes generated. However, authentic practice was represented by five codes, and integrated practice by one. The small difference between the number of codes for performance and authentic practice is perhaps an indication that principal teachers view development planning from both a performance *and* authentic practice dimension.

Performance responses of all five principal teachers in May revealed that they were in agreement that the development plan influenced learning and teaching as a vehicle through which to implement HGIOS 3 and the priorities of the school development plan. Four out of five principal teachers felt that development planning was an imposed government initiative.

It is of interest that three out of five principal teachers felt that the school development plan did not influence the department development plan, despite all five agreeing that the development plan was a way to implement the priorities of the school development plan. Perhaps this may have revealed an example of 'fabricated compliance' amongst principal teachers.

Authentic responses of all five principal teachers in May revealed that they saw development planning as a way to focus on personal professional issues. Four out of five felt that the development plan influenced the management of people, change, budget and resources within departments. One principal teacher only, felt that the development plan impacted directly on learning and teaching. This perhaps is an indication that principal teachers view the process of development planning as an exercise to satisfy the demands of performance, rather than a way in which to improve learning and teaching.

Integrated practice was represented by only one code, where one principal teacher felt that development planning led to changes in learning and teaching according to context. This could be interpreted in terms of performance in exams or the authentic practice of meeting pupils learning needs.

In September, only two codes representing performance practice were generated, compared with seven in May. Again, this might reflect the fact that development planning documentation is completed in May, and also perhaps that development planning is not a continuous process amongst principal teachers.

Two principal teachers responded in September that development planning was a process through which the priorities of HGIS 3 and the school development plan could be implemented, compared to five responses in May. Two respondents indicated that they found the development plan useful in September. This might have been because at this time of the school year, principal teachers have had time to reflect upon their development plan.

Authentic practice was represented by four codes in September, compared to five codes in May. This indicates perhaps a more consistent approach to authentic practice during the process of development planning, compared to performance practice which generated two codes in September and seven codes in May.

Inconsistency in the approach to self evaluation and subsequently development planning, is perhaps indicated by the responses of three principal teachers in September who commented that the process of self evaluation was not continuous throughout the year. Two principal teachers felt that addressing pupils learning needs was a priority at this time, with one principal teacher again indicating the usefulness of the development plan in the management of people, change, budget and resources within their department.

Question 7 *"How useful is STACS data in development planning?"*

In May, principal teacher responses generated only one new code, whereas in September eight new codes were generated, four of which related to the total performance practice responses. This perhaps indicates that principal teachers felt STACS data was more of a priority in September and articulated this through the generation of new codes.

In May, performance practice was prevalent amongst principal teachers, which focused mainly on the priority areas of HGIOS, and the school development plan (two responses). Attainment of year groups, together with selection of only those learning and teaching methods which resulted in a higher self evaluation rating, were also priorities at this time reflected in the responses from two principal teachers.

In September, authentic practice dominated where the focus of all five principal teachers was on the progress of individual pupils. It is perhaps surprising that STACS data, which has strong associations with performance, is also viewed in terms of authentic practice by principal teachers.

However, three out of five principal teachers commented that progress in learning and attainment was limited, implying perhaps the presence of a 'glass ceiling' beyond which pupils could not achieve. This could perhaps be interpreted as the view that pupils have a limited capacity for learning, beyond which no improvement can be made irrespective of developments in learning and teaching.

Again, one principal teacher indicated that self evaluation procedures were not systematically undertaken throughout the year.

Although authentic practice dominated slightly in September with five codes generated, compared to performance practice which generated four codes, there was greater agreement amongst principal teachers within the performance practice codes. All five principal teachers responded that STACS data did not inform their development plan, but that they found the development plan a useful tool.

Again, two principal teachers indicated that the development plan was not influenced by the school development plan. This is perhaps an indication that principal teachers are existing in 'silos' and do not view themselves as part of a larger organisation.
In May, integrated practice was represented by one new code where one principal teacher felt that internal assessment data was useful. This could perhaps be interpreted as useful in terms of exam attainment, or identifying pupils learning needs.

In September, two codes were generated for integrated practice. All five principal teachers felt that individual pupil data (such as MidYis) was useful, again as perhaps a predictor of attainment in exams or to identify areas of support in learning. Four out of five principal teachers felt the needs of pupils were not being met. This perhaps could refer to pastoral needs, or learning needs to improve attainment.

Question 8 *" To whom are you accountable?"*

Performance practice was clearly more dominant in May, generating eight codes compared to September where only four codes were generated. All five principal teachers responded in May that they saw accountability in terms of attainment of year groups. This might perhaps, reflect the influence of the SQA external examinations which were taking place within the school at this time.

Two principal teachers responded in terms of performance practice, that self evaluation was completed only once a year. Another two principal teachers commented on the difficulty of interpreting the current presentation of STACS data.

In May, authentic practice was represented by two codes. However, all five principal teachers commented that they found external exam data to be of very little use in the development of learning and teaching. Three out of five principal teachers felt that they were accountable for addressing the learning needs of individual pupils.

In September, authentic practice was dominant with five codes generated compared to four for performance, and two for integrated practice. Different aspects of accountability were expressed by principal teachers in September compared to May.

All five principal teachers felt they were accountable to parents, with three out of five expressing accountability to pupils and themselves as priorities. Two out of five principal teachers felt they were accountable to colleagues , with one principal teacher prioritising accountability to outside agencies. Another commented that accountability erodes autonomy.

Performance practice in September generated four codes, and reflected agreement amongst all five principal teachers that accountability was viewed in terms of their position within the hierarchal structure of school management. It is perhaps of interest that accountability for attainment of pupils is not mentioned here, when STACS data becomes available to principal teachers in September.

Two principal teachers regarded accountability in terms of managing career reviews, development planning and other performance procedures.

Integrated practice was represented in both May and September. Common to both was the code for accountability for practice, where one principal teacher responded each time. This could perhaps be interpreted as professional practice in meeting the learning needs of individuals, or in achieving good examination results.

4.7.1 Final Summary of Principal Teacher Responses

In May of the school year, responses of principal teachers to the interview questions reflected mainly performance practice, whereas in September authentic practice was more prevalent amongst the professional practice of principal teachers. This could perhaps have been due to the fact that within the case study school, principal teachers are required to complete development planning and self evaluation documentation in May, together with the career review of their teaching staff.

In September, authentic practice was most prevalent amongst principal teachers, perhaps as a result of performance management documentation having been completed in May, apart from the departmental standards and quality report.

Principal teachers were also concerned at this time with the new intake of S1 pupils to the school.

Of those practices common to both May and September, according to the data generated from all eight interview questions, performance practice was dominant generating seven examples, of which teaching in order to improve exam results was the most common. Authentic practice was represented by five examples common to

both May and September, of which the management of people, change, resources and budget was the most common to both.

A significantly smaller number of codes reflecting integrated practice were generated by principal teachers in May and September compared to those of performance or authentic practice. This perhaps is an indication that principal teachers perceive their professional practice distinctly in terms of either performance or authentic practice, revealing perhaps the disjunction between the two types of professional practice as proposed by McNess et al (2003).

4.7.2 Final Summary of Head Teacher Responses

Of the nineteen coded responses to the eight interview questions presented to the head teacher, fifteen reflected performance practice and four reflected authentic practice.

No responses were coded as integrated practice. This outcome is perhaps not surprising, as the head teacher is under a great deal of pressure from the education authority and parent council, to fulfil effectively the legislative demands of performance within the school.

The greatest number of performance practice responses during the interview referred to the improvement of the professional practice of principal teachers using the evidence of departmental external examination results presented as STACS data. The purpose and role of quality assurance procedures, change management, and effective evaluation of learning and teaching in managing and improving the professional practice of principal teachers, was also a priority of the head teacher.

The need to manage and improve the professional practice of principal teachers, was reinforced by the frequent reference by the head teacher to the need for principal teachers to be accountable within the formal hierarchal structure of accountability within the school, together with the need for principal teachers to be able to carry out a systematic and meaningful analysis of STACS data for their department.

The responses of the head teacher during the interview indicated that principal teachers were expected to carry out self evaluation procedures within their departments continuously throughout the year, and have a consistent approach to quality assurance. The interview data indicated that this was contrary to the view of principal teachers.

Within the interview responses of the head teacher, twelve new codes were generated out of fifteen representing performance practice. This perhaps is an indication of the priority given by the head teacher to the demands of performativity.

Only four codes were generated which represented authentic practice, with the most frequent of these being mentioned during the interview being the importance of departmental autonomy. There appears to be a tension here between the head teacher's priorities of departmental autonomy, and managing the professional performance of principal teachers.

Analysis of the interview responses of the head teacher and principal teachers indicates that the one area of commonality between the two, appeared to be the authentic practice of the development of learning and teaching within the case study school.

The results presented within this chapter have revealed the main themes emerging from the principal teacher and head teacher interviews, to be those of *accountability, management* and *performance.* The significance of the resulting impact of these themes on the professional practice of principal teachers within the case study school, will be considered and discussed in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Discussion of Results

Theme of 'Accountability'

5.1 Introduction

The main themes identified within the principal teacher interview data gathered in May and September of the school academic year 2007 were 1) accountability, 2) management and 3) performance. The responses of principal teachers were recorded and grouped according to overarching theme. The greatest number of codes were grouped under the themes of 'accountability', 'management' and 'performance'. This evident from the tables of principal teacher responses in Chapter 4.

Each of these themes will be discussed in turn within this chapter, drawing on evidence from both the research and the literature. Analysis of both sets of principal teacher interview data, revealed that the highest frequency of recurring codes, were those that could be classified under the three main themes. The frequency response charts for each interview question (Chapter 4) indicate that principal teachers within the case study school regard perspectives of accountability almost entirely in terms of performance practices. These include development planning, self-evaluation, class observation and career review.

As indicated in Chapter 2, within Scottish education, there is a clear focus on "accountability" due in part to the relaxing of powers and responsibilities held by education authorities in the 1990's, which resulted in devolved school management

and a subsequent increase in performance management practices within schools, as part of the quasi-market in education intended to raise improve school performance.

According to Hoyle and John (1995:109),

> *"The accountability movement has adopted a mixture of bureaucratic and market forms."*

Bureaucratic accountability involves government agencies promoting rules and regulations intended to assure citizens that public functions will be carried out in pursuit of public goals voiced through democratic or legal processes. An example of this form of accountability within the case study school, is the School Board. This meets three times per academic year, and consists of the head teacher (Chair), parents representatives (volunteers) and one teacher (volunteer). Within this forum, the head teacher generally discusses the school development plan, and issues such as discipline and school uniform. There is no direct contact between the School Board and the working life of the school. Teachers are unaware of the agenda of School Board meetings, and do not receive minutes. There is no direct accountability of teachers to the School Board.

Parental involvement within the school occurs through personal meetings with the head teacher, parent's evenings, or awards ceremonies. Parents' evenings provide an opportunity for parents to speak directly to teachers regarding their child's progress, and where teachers may be held directly accountable for the learning experience of pupils although there is no formal mechanism for this. However, interviews are limited to a maximum of five minutes, after which parents may be referred to the senior management team if they required further discussion.

HMIE have inspected four departments within the case study school over the past six years. This involved a team of Inspectors spending two days within each department, attending some classes and speaking directly to teachers for a few minutes. Significantly more time was spent with the head teacher discussing the operation of management systems, rather than on the accountability of individuals. Market accountability allows consumers to choose services, which best meet, their needs (Hoyle and John, 1995). According to Darling- Hammond (1989: 61),

"Governments may choose to allow clients or consumers to choose which services best meet their needs; to preserve the utility of this form of accountability, monopolies are prevented, freedom of choice is protected, and truthful information is required of service providers."

The information pack provided to the parents of new pupils joining the case study school however, does not contain performance data such as external exam results. These, together with information on attendance, exclusions and so on are held by the education authority, available to parents by request.

The case study school is one of two state secondary schools on a Scottish island, with a population of 22,000. It is the larger of the two schools with 985 pupils, the other school having a roll of 395. The case study school is situated on the east side of the island, with the other school on the west coast. Pupils living in the east attend the case study school, while those living in the west attend the other secondary school. The main town is situated in the east, which results in a higher roll within the case study school.

Parental choice is confined to these two schools, which is primarily determined by geographical location, and the school transport system. Due to the remote location of

many homes, the school bus is essential for taking pupils to and from school each day. However, there are no school buses running east to west and vice versa, which critically limits the 'free choice' of parents to send their children to either school.

The forces of market accountability within the rural location of the case study school are perhaps not as prevalent as within an urban mainland school, where the transport infrastructure supports parental choice. It could be said that the case study school has a monopoly within the eastern side of the island, which is contrary to Darling-Hammond's definition of market accountability. It appears then that market mechanisms of accountability together with those of bureaucratic accountability, are weak within the rural location of the case study school. This places even greater importance on the use of self-evaluation using HGIOS 3 as a lever for school improvement, in the absence of quasi-market mechanisms such as parental choice. Pupil attainment within the case study school however, continues to decline, perhaps due to fabricated compliance with self-evaluation procedures on the behalf of the principal teachers. The number of pupils in S5 gaining three or more Higher exams has shown a decrease over the last five years. The number of pupils in S4 gaining credit level at standard grade has shown little improvement over the same period of time.

This research has attempted to identify the predominant forces of accountability affecting principal teachers within the case study school, and their resulting consequences on teacher professionalism.

The effect of this culture of accountability on Scottish principal teachers within the case study school is considered. The concept of a 'profession' as applied to teaching, may consist of the ability to make judgements and choices within a particular dynamic context, together with the ability to pursue a problem solving approach.

How effective a teacher is within the areas of 'responsibility' and 'knowledge', may be significantly affected by many other areas of professionalism, such as 'autonomy' and 'accountability'. These in turn may be affected by the model of education management within a school, and performance management practices. These elements will now be considered in turn, by discussing the outcomes of the research data with the literature.

A summary of the extent to which the theme of accountability influences development planning and the professional practice of principal teachers will be considered in section 5.2. Examination from the research data of the commonalities within the theme of accountability between the May and September research data 2007 will follow in section 5.3. This will include consideration of the hierarchal structure of accountability within the case study school in section 5.3.1, the accountability of principal teachers to parents, pupils and outside agencies in section 5.3.2, followed by the accountability of principal teachers for learning and teaching in section 5.3.3. Aspects of the theme of accountability from the research data in May 2007 will be examined in section 5.4, which will include the accountability of principal teachers for pupil needs in section 5.4.1, and consideration of self-evaluation and autonomy in section 5.4.2.

Aspects of the theme accountability from the research data in September 2007, will be examined in section 5.5, followed by the outcomes of STACS data analysis in section 5.5.1. This will be followed by consideration of the accountability of principal teachers for pupil success in section 5.5.2.

Finally, a summary of the discussion relating to the theme of accountability, will be presented in section 5.6

5.2 Summary of Theme of "Accountability"

To what extent can the analysis of the theme "accountability" within both the research data and the literature, provide an answer to the research question,

> *"What impact does development planning as a tool of performance management, have on the professional practice of principal teachers within the case study school?"*

The hierarchical system within a formal model of management is evident within the case study school. The emphasis is on vertical relationships between staff, and the exertion of "control" through positional power within the hierarchy. Research data reveals the perception of the accountability of five principal teachers to the faculty head, with no reference being made to the accountability of class teachers to the principal teacher. Accountability of class and principal teachers, is primarily for attainment of pupils in terms of external examination results. This focus on accountability 'upwards', may be the result of the "corrupting effects" of quality indicators, creating a need in principal teachers to be seen in the best possible light by their line managers and education authority.

The research data indicates that within learning and teaching, the emphasis is on meeting the performance requirements of the education authority, rather than on the needs of individual pupils. This was evident in the large number of codes generated from principal teacher responses regarding learning and teaching, reflecting performance practice, rather than authentic or integrated practices.

The exception to this view was apparent from comments made by principal teacher A, who placed greater emphasis on the development of individual skills. The success of

pupils who are able to develop communication skills with peers for example, is not quantifiable through formal examinations. These pupils would not therefore, be regarded as meeting the attainment targets of the education authority, although would be successful in meeting their own personal targets, reflecting perhaps 'authentic practice'.

This is reinforced by Bush and West–Burnham (1994), who observe that senior management teams are placing teachers under more pressure to be accountable for *what* and *how* they teach, rather than meeting the needs of individual pupils.

Increased accountability of principal teachers through development planning procedures reduces autonomy and increases the tension between "authentic" and "performance" practices. The data revealed that the greatest number of codes generated by principal teachers responding to questions relating to development planning, were those reflecting performance practice. Responses indicated that principal teachers were prioritising their time following performance procedures, rather than pursuing authentic teaching practices.

In May of the school academic year, the main focus of principal teachers, according to the research data, was the audit of the previous year's development plan, and the production of a new one. The research data at this time revealed two distinct interpretations of "pupil needs". Subject principal teachers had a managerialist interpretation, which centred on the allocation of resources. Principal teachers of pastoral care A and B however, interpreted "pupil needs" as the support required to progress individual skills.

Within departments of the case study school, self-evaluation procedures were carried out in May using HGIOS 2. This influenced future development planning through

managerial control exerted through the school development plan, and according to the views of principal teachers, resulted in a decrease in professional autonomy. This was perhaps because they had to spend time on the operational requirements of development planning, rather than on their own development needs.

According to HMIE (2007), the principal purpose of self – evaluation procedures and development planning, is to "improve the learning experience of pupils" and "empower teachers." Research evidence from the interviews in May did not reflect this perspective, but indicated that self-evaluation was perceived as a device to ensure good performance from teachers, which did not mean focusing on the learning experience of pupils, but rather focused on the effectiveness of the professional practices of teachers in reaching pupil attainment targets. This was evident from the greatest number of codes being generated reflecting 'performance' rather than 'authentic' practice.

In September of the school academic year, principal teachers were mainly concerned with the task of analysing STACS data, which within the case study school is only carried out at this time of the year. Research data indicated that the efficiency and effectiveness of the school was not so much *verified* as *constructed* around the audit process (Power, 1977).

Four out of five principal teachers felt that STACS data gave only "part of the picture", and were used primarily to hold teachers to account, inducing a "fear" of external data analysis. Principal teachers felt "obliged" to analyse external exam data, perhaps implying that it was being used as a mechanism of compliance.

Information obtained from STACS analysis was not found to have a direct influence on departmental development planning.

Evidence from the research data within the case study school, suggests that principal teachers C, D, and E have adopted "performance practices" when viewed through the perspective of accountability. It might be said that they have become de-skilled as organisers of the learning process, and reconstructed as administrative managers, compelled to believe that a commitment to development planning, career review and analysis of pupil performance data will somehow achieve a higher level of professionalism, or "new professionalism" (Ball 1990:153).

Furthermore, research evidence from the case study school appeared to confirm the view of Wexler (1998:174) that,

"New professionals as middle managers, will be positioned in a meritocratic, bureaucratic and hierarchal structured "educational corporatism."

This however may have been the impression principal teachers gave in the case study school by going through the motions of performance practice, rather than the reality. Brief field notes compiled following each interview, suggested that when principal teachers were speaking about development planning and self-evaluation, they did so with an air of resignation and reluctant compliance.

The theme of "accountability" will be discussed and compared with the literature, firstly on common aspects of the theme which arose in the May and September interview data, and secondly on differences between the two sets of data, drawing on perspectives presented within the literature. Evidence will be presented from the research to support the argument that principal teachers within the case study school have adopted performance practices in order to comply with mechanisms of accountability.

5.3 Commonalities Between the May and September Research Data

Common themes emerged relating to accountability within the May and September data. These were that accountability was mainly bureaucratic, operating within a hierarchal school management structure. Accountability for learning and teaching was viewed in terms of STACS performance data, rather than meeting the needs of individual pupils. These findings are discussed more fully in the following section.

5.3.1 Hierarchal Structure of Accountability

The following statement from principal teacher A, reflects the form of accountability suggested by the research findings within the case study school, namely that of bureaucratic accountability, which has a focus on outcome based targets, performance reporting, managing budget, and monitoring pupil attainment.

"Certainly I think we are more accountable in terms of how we deal with our resources in a time when budgets are either being cut, or standing still."

The case study school is constructed around a formal model of management, which emphasises the official, structural elements of the school as an organisation. The primary focus of the formal model is the pursuit of institutional objectives through rational approaches. According to Bush (1995:29)

"Formal models assume that organisations are hierarchal systems in which managers use rational means to pursue agreed goals. Head teachers pass authority legitimised by their formal positions within the organisation, and are accountable to sponsoring bodies for the activities of their institutions."

The hierarchal system within the formal model emphasises *vertical* relationships between staff, which within the case study school takes the form of the classic

hierarchal structure of class teacher – principal teacher – faculty head – head teacher – education authority. This exerts a level of 'control' over individuals, due to the positional power of leaders within this structure.

"Members work under accepted leader's legitimate authority ... by virtue of office held at a particular time" (Ferguson, 1980:535).

According to Packwood (1977: 1),

"The hierarchy is the general structure in all developed cultures for achieving work objectives that are beyond the control of a single individual. Through a series of manager – subordinate relationships, it explicitly locates accountability for work."

Packwood's reference to the "location of accountability for work" is reflected in the observation from principal teacher D that;

"There are different levels of accountability for different purposes...the head teacher is the ultimate line manager for principal teachers."

This is confirmed by principal teacher B who states,

I'm accountable to my line manager in the first instance."

Packwood goes on to observe,

"The manager in the hierarchy is accountable not only for his or her performance, but also for the work of subordinates."

The research data revealed no reference to the accountability of principal teachers for the performance of class teachers, with evidence clearly illustrating the emphasis on accountability "upwards" within the hierarchal structure. This poses the question as to *why* no reference was made to the accountability of class teachers to the principal teacher, when the latter clearly have responsibility for monitoring and reporting on the quality of professional practice within their departments. This could perhaps be an example of the corrupting effects of performance practice as proposed by Fitz-Gibbon

(1996). Principal teachers within the case study school could perhaps be adopting the behaviour of perceiving their accountability role in an upward direction only, due to an powerful innate need to be seen in the best possible light by their own line manager. They feel that they must be seen to be performing effectively, in order to maintain their status within the school and the local community. Although there was no indication of accountability of principal teachers towards class teachers within the research data, within the hierarchal system principal teachers *are* accountable to class teachers for curriculum development, and provision of resources, together with appropriate professional development opportunities for example.

Within a bureaucratic organisation, Packwood (1977:1) suggests,

"Authority to prescribe work passes from senior to junior roles, while accountability for the performance of work passes in the reverse direction from junior to senior."

Perhaps the lack of reference to accountability of class teachers to principal teachers within the research data, suggests that middle managers lack sufficient guidelines on, and are uncomfortable with, how to approach lack of performance in class teachers through the application of sanctions. This is clarified to some extent by Kogan (1986:25) who defines 'accountability' as,

"A condition in which individual role holders are liable to review, and the application of sanctions, if their actions fail to satisfy those with whom they are in an accountability relationship."

Principal teachers are unable to apply 'hard' sanctions such as pay or promotion, but may apply 'soft' sanctions such as class and budget allocation. However, there was no evidence within the research data that these had been duly applied by the participants.

As accountability is central to the hierarchal model of management, teacher autonomy and therefore decision making on whole school issues are limited, and as Lortie (1969:1) observes,

"The several strands of hierarchal control, collegial control and autonomy, become tangled and complex."

Although the main focus of accountability within the research data, at both times of the academic year, was on the position of principal teachers within the hierarchal structure and their subsequent accountability to their line manager, some reference was made regarding accountability to other stakeholders.

Principal teachers are directly accountable to the head teacher within the hierarchal structure, through formal procedures such as development planning. However, the head teacher stated,

"They are not as accountable as I would like them to be. They should be more accountable."

It seemed that the head teacher was referring to the performance of principal teachers in raising the attainment of pupils. He implied that if principal teachers were more accountable, then perhaps they would produce better results.

When referring to development planning within the school, he continued,

"It is a mechanical process ... they do it without thinking."

This statement seemed to indicate that the head teacher was aware of the compliance of principal teachers, which raises questions about the value of accountability through performance management practices such as development planning.

5.3.2 Accountability to Parents, Pupils and Outside Agencies

From the research data, there were only two references made regarding accountability to parents and pupils, by principal teachers A and D respectively. Only principal teacher A referred to the need for accountability to outside agencies.

Sockett (1980:32) argues that teachers *should* be accountable to the following groups, whether or not they recognise and accept these various levels of responsibility.

a) Individual pupils and parents

b) Education authority

c) Resource providers – education authority and government

d) Professional peers inside and outside school

e) Other educational institutions

f) The "public"

g) Industry and Trade Unions

Principal teachers A and D, were commenting on their accountability to pupils and parents, from their situated position within the hierarchal structure of the school. Principal teacher D said,

"I am accountable first to pupils and parents, then secondly to the faculty head and head teacher."

Perhaps because this principal teacher had been in post for only three years, accountability to pupils and parents was articulated, whereas longer serving principal teachers may take this for granted, or have become so immersed in quality assurance systems, that the needs of individual pupils and parents have become less important.

Principal teacher A referred to the need to be accountable to parents, the education authority and outside agencies. This may be due to the fact that this principal teacher has daily contact with parents and outside agencies in her role of pupil support. Subject principal teachers however, have much less direct involvement with parents and outside agencies, which is indeed referred to by principal teacher A, who feels she has "accountability in a different way" when commenting,

"... We are also accountable to parents and the education authority in the sense we will have...you know, they have the educational psychologist and other agencies. We have social work coming in, we have to justify and explain to them what we are doing, and have to work with them. So I think we have accountability in a different way, but I would say in an equally demanding way."

Principal teacher A is involved in providing support for pupils with special educational needs, and behavioural problems. This requires regular contact with pupils, parents and outside agencies. Goldsmith and Clutterbuck (1984) refer to the need for professionals to work in partnership with parents in decision making about pupils with support needs. They observe that problems are more easily resolved by parents and teachers working together, than by either alone. (Although it is acknowledged that there can be a tension between meeting the needs of pupils and being accountable to parents.) This can result in a positive impact on learning and teaching, the importance of which is confirmed by principal teacher A, whose teaching experience allowed her to engage in meaningful discussions regarding learning and teaching with parents,

"I am glad I am a secondary teacher, and have my own teaching credibility."

What is being referred to here may be the perception that when dealing with mainly pastoral issues, parents might feel that principal teacher A may not be held

accountable for learning and teaching issues. However, as a qualified subject teacher, principal teacher A is perhaps stating that this is not the case.

From the research data, no other reference could be found to the other dimensions of accountability proposed by Sockett (1980), perhaps because they are innate to principal teachers. It is perhaps possible that principal teachers do indeed address the other dimensions of accountability, but that these were not referred to during the interview process as principal teachers are so used to working within these areas of accountability, that they did not place a great deal of importance upon them during discussions.

5.3.3 Accountability for Learning and Teaching

Principal teachers' perception of the need to be accountable for learning and teaching was apparent in the interview data from both the May and September interviews. However, there appeared to be a significant emphasis on meeting performance requirements of the SQA, rather than on the needs of individual pupils.

In September, principal teacher C indicated that her main priority was "pace of learning". When asked why this was important, she replied,

"To show they (pupils) maximise their learning and the syllabus coverage for the prelims after Christmas, according to SQA requirements."

This perhaps reflects the pressure on the principal teacher to be accountable for external exam results, and provides an illustration of the view that Schon (1991:345) proposes,

"When the professional works in an institution whose knowledge structure reinforces his image of expertise, then he tends to see himself as accountable for nothing more

than the delivery of his stock techniques – according to the measures of performance imposed on him."

Principal teacher A had a completely different perspective, where exam results were less important than personal achievement, such as supporting a pupil with behavioural problem to complete a whole lesson, and went on to state,

"We know we are not going to get brilliant results, and it will affect STACS and all the rest of it, but for that pupil ... that's a really great achievement."

This perceived need to be aware and accountable for pupil learning is echoed by principal teacher E, who recognised the importance of assessing personal achievement, rather than the accumulation of exam results when stating,

" ... Try to assess how far forward they (pupils) have moved in their learning experiences. That to me is more meaningful."

The remaining three subject principal teachers viewed accountability for learning and teaching, only from the perspective of producing good exam results.

In referring to the accountability of teachers to pupils, Schon (1991:293) observes,

"The professional's accountability for his performance is mainly to his professional peers. He is of course directly accountable to his client: but often the client has limited ability to determine whether or not legitimate expectations have been met."

Accountability to pupils was mentioned once throughout the interview process by principal teacher A, together with accountability to peers. Principal teacher A states,

"... I am also accountable to colleagues."

This lack of perceived accountability to colleagues may be as a result of the nature of subject teaching, where teachers exists in 'silos' with little communication with the

environment outside regarding the views of others. However, it is surprising that little reference was made to accountability to colleagues within the same subject area.

Within the hierarchal model of management within the case study school, it can be easy for the senior management team to find themselves serving the needs of teachers, rather than pupils, reflecting an increasing pressure on teachers to be accountable for *what* and *how* they teach, rather than meeting the needs of individual pupils (Bush and West-Burnham, 1994). This may lead to increased accountability and less autonomy for teachers, applying more tension between "authentic' and "performance" practice.

Bennet (1976), Galton (1980), and Alexander (1985) point to the fact that teachers frequently change their teaching styles and relationships with pupils. Fitness for purpose combined with the application of professional judgement, are two extremely powerful reasons why teachers should be free to make personal judgements concerning teaching methods.

However an opposing view is presented by Hargreaves (1992:8), who proposes that increased teacher autonomy may *not* benefit the learning experience of pupils by stating,

"Under the guise of professional autonomy, teachers continue to teach largely within the isolated privacy of their own classrooms, insulated from observation and criticism; are reluctant to share professional problems and display the same anti-intellectual suspicions of talking seriously about education in general terms, as opposed to gossiping about the particularities of school life."

Sockett (1980) proposes that teachers should be accountable for learning outcomes, and for the process leading to these outcomes. This surely is dependant on consensual agreement regarding the nature and aims of education. Conflict over values could

result in schools being reluctant to accept that certain demands for accountability are legitimate.

5.4 Aspects of the Theme Accountability – Research Data May 2007

5.4.1 Principal Teachers' Accountability for 'Pupil Needs'

At this time of the academic year, principal teachers are required to carry out an audit of the previous year's development plan, and subsequently produce a new one. This reflects the bureaucratic paradigm of accountability, the main features of which are the annual audit of departmental targets and outcomes, a standards and quality report, and career review. Outcome based targets and performance reporting are needed to identify problem areas, implement change, manage budgets, and monitor the attainment of pupils.

Within the hierarchal management structure, principal teachers are accountable to the head teacher for the effective use of allocated budget, and the provision of appropriate resources to meet pupil needs. The submission of a departmental development plan / standards and quality report to the head teacher, could directly impact on the learning experience of pupils. However, principal teacher E commented that he received no communication on how these documents were subsequently used by the senior management team and education authority. Regarding the fate of the departmental development plan once submitted, he went on to state,

"... My faculty head reads it, then files it and forgets about it!"

perhaps reinforcing the observation of Foucault (1977:200) that,

"Audit is essentially a relationship of power between scrutiniser and observed; the latter are rendered objects of information, never subjects in communication."

This managerial approach can directly affect the work environment, where time within the teaching day must be found for consultation with colleagues, senior management team, following quality assurance procedures, and completion of documentation, diminishing time spent on classroom practice.

There is a clear tension here between procedures needed to ensure pupils are provided with the resources they need for effective learning, and committing sufficient time to classroom teaching in order to maximise the quality of learning.

The research data suggests that principal teachers B, C, and D, interpreted the meaning of "pupil needs" from the managerialist stance of efficient allocation of resources. Principal teacher B commented,

"We're really struggling to keep up with youngsters now in terms of ICT provision."

Principal teacher D remarked,

"... we are looking at being at being more selective (about the number of pupils that are able to enter a course) in S3."

Principal teachers E and A however, interpreted the meaning of "pupil needs" as the support needed to progress individual skills. This is illustrated by the comment from principal teacher A who states,

"One of the things we will introduce more formally for next year is at the end of each topic in each year, pupils will have a review sheet. ... pupils will have the opportunity to say how they felt about it, what was good about it, and how it could be improved."

All five principal teachers were under the same 'performance pressures' in May of the academic year. Three reflected 'performance practice' in their responses regarding pupil needs. Principal teacher A, perhaps predictably as a pastoral care teacher, reflected 'authentic practice' focusing on the needs of the individual pupil. However, it was unexpected to find that this was also the focus of the principal teacher E, a subject teacher, at this time, possibly indicating resistance to performance management strategies. Alternatively, this could reflect the strength of teacher – pupil relationships, due to individual pupil attention as a result perhaps, of an individualized learning approach providing a greater level of one to one tuition, than within other subject disciplines.

5.4.2 Self –Evaluation and Autonomy

Within the case study school, self-evaluation procedures using HGIOS 2 (HMIE) are carried out in May of the academic year. This document attempts to combine self-evaluation and performance management together, with the use of quality indicators that address the current national priorities within Scottish education: Achievement, Attainment, Framework for Learning, Inclusion and Equality, Values and Citizenship, and Learning for Life.

The model of bureaucratic accountability within the school operates through the use of self-evaluation procedures, which in turn influence future planning and targets, resulting in a reduction in the professional autonomy of teachers.

The strategic management of the case study school is a limiting factor in the potential growth of teacher autonomy, due to the tension between two opposing approaches.

First, the managerial approach through the co-ordination of staff and departments in order to achieve the goals of the school through development planning in line with the school development plan, constrains autonomy. This state of affairs is commented upon by Ball (1994:60) who states,

"The school development plan signifies and celebrates the exclusion and subjection of the teacher, who loses control over classroom planning decisions, and is monitored, judged and compared by criteria set elsewhere. It is a device for achieving change and asserting control."

This framework of control is perhaps reflected in the following comment from principal teacher E, who states,

"The departmental development plan gives us that time to audit, evaluate, plan and implement changes. I'm comfortable with that. It gives me a framework ... a structure ... a certain security."

This principal teacher appeared to be content with the fact that control has been removed from him. However, although the framework of the development plan is set by the school, and agreed upon by the education authority, this principal teacher does have autonomy in terms of the information which he chooses to include within the development plan.

Second, the assertion of control appears to be counteracted by the promotion of autonomy, brought about by the division of labour within a school into specific departments, each with their own priorities. This was confirmed by the research data, where principal teachers indicated that they do not view, or discuss the development plans of other departments within the school. This view was confirmed by the head teacher who stated,

"What I was going to say about development planning is that there is a danger of giving too much autonomy to departments, because there is a tendency for them to regard themselves as semi-autonomous republics."

This tension between self-evaluation/development planning and departmental autonomy, can be potentially reduced by "loose-coupling", where the connection between the two approaches is weak and unpredictable (Weick, 2001:43), which is evident within the case study school.

McNess et.al. (2003) undertook research involving primary teachers in England, which showed that the imposition of national priorities resulted in a loss of personal fulfilment and autonomy, although personal moral responsibility was still important. There was evidence from the research of a shift of climate from a *covenant* based on trust, to a *contract* based on the delivery of education to meet external requirements, and national economic goals. This was reflected within the research data, where principal teachers were primarily concerned with the completion of externally imposed operations such as self-evaluation, rather than using their initiative to engage pupils in meaningful learning.

The main purpose of self-evaluation and development planning, as a tool of performance management, is both to "improve the learning experience of pupils" and "empower" teachers according to HMIE (2007). Shore and Wright (2000:58) however, propose that this form of audit,

"... rests upon a simultaneous imposition of external control from above, and the internalisation of new norms, so that individuals can continuously improve themselves. The teaching professional is a depersonalised unit of economic resource, whose productivity and performance must be constantly measured and enhanced."

Responsibility for the performance of class teachers and provision of appropriate CPD, through career review, falls to principal teachers and indeed was cited as a priority in May of the academic year by the principal teachers C, D, and E.

Within the case study school, funding for teacher CPD is only accessible if a strong link is made to both national and local priorities, reinforcing the emphasis on meeting national economic goals and thereby further reducing teacher autonomy.

Research data indicates that self-evaluation procedures are only carried out by principal teachers in May of the academic year, providing evidence of the real effects of the audit process through the "ritualisation of performance" as identified by Power (1997:140) who states,

"Audit transforms environments, encouraging the ritualisation of performance and the tokenistic gestures of accountability, paper systems and audit trails, to the detriment of real effectiveness."

There is an indication that this is indeed the situation within the case study school, where despite the establishment of quality assurance procedures, the school's position within the examination league tables continues to fall year on year. Perhaps a different approach to school improvement is needed, where the emphasis is on the school as a learning community which employs distributed leadership, rather than on the procedural aspects of quality assurance systems.

Within the case study school, self-evaluation has been carried out over the last five years according to the QI's in HGIOS 2 (HMIE). In January 2008, a new version of this document, HGIOS 3, was introduced and was used by principal teachers for self-evaluation in May 2008. It is proposed by both the HMIE and the education authority, that the new QI's will make self-evaluation procedures more "user friendly".

However, another dimension to the introduction of HGIOS 3 is proposed by Shore and Wright (2000:59) who observe that,

"QI's only have a shelf life of two years. After that time, people get wise to them. The intention is to keep people on their toes by making them feel insecure."

This view however, did not resonate with principal teacher A who reflected,

"The new version of the QI's and HGIOS I think are much preferred to the existing ones. I want to do everything on the new ones because the whole support bit is done quite differently, and it really puts responsibility for all the pupils back in the class with departments, with us in the role that we should be."

This may be a reference to the view that the new QI's place more accountability for planning and implementing individual pupil support on departments, allowing principal teachers of pastoral care more time to liaise with parents, together with the co-ordination of personal pupil support plans across the school.

5.5 Aspects of the Theme Accountability – Research Data September 2007

5.5.1. Analysis of STACS data

External examination data from the Scottish Qualifications Authority is generally returned to schools in the form of Standard Tables and Charts, or "STACS" data.

Reference to the accountability of principal teachers for both teacher and pupil performance, appeared within the research data gathered in May and September. However, there was greater emphasis on the *analysis* of STACS data within the September data. This may have been because at this time of the academic year, an

interpretation of the case study school's external exam data by an external consultant, is distributed to principal teachers.

There is a focus on the importance of examination data. Foucault (1997) suggests that the advent of examination was associated with a qualitative form of control, in which the relatively anonymous individual of traditional society becomes subject to "hierarchal observation" and "normalising judgement".

External assessment then, appears to impose its own values on the activities it regulates. This means that the process could have unintended and possibly dysfunctional consequences. There is a danger that perhaps within a meritocratic system which is part of the Scottish education tradition, too much emphasis is placed on the outcomes and requirements of national qualifications, although it is recognised that they have an important role to play in educational progression.

Wynne (2004:18) draws attention to the negative effects of summative assessment on learning and teaching by observing,

"Research shows the impact of summative assessment has negative consequences for teaching and pupil learning, which can be balanced by the use of formative methods."

Implementation of formative assessment approaches is currently a national priority within Scottish schools, and must appear on the school development plan and subsequently each departmental development plan within the case study school. The research data in September contained references to CPD activities in formative assessment, perhaps indicating a move towards counterbalancing the perceived negative effects of summative assessment methods.

Cowie, Taylor and Croxford (2006:2) suggest that external examination data (STACS) provides a narrow focus in academic attainment, and measures only that

which is easy to measure. Concern over this apparent exclusion of qualitative measures, was expressed by principal teacher E,

"There's three sides to impact (on learning and teaching). National measures, internal observations, and dialogue with pupils and staff, all of equal merit. STACS tends to look at the national picture, and not at the other two sides of the triangle."

Cowie, Taylor and Croxford (2006) also propose that STACS data is used primarily to hold teachers to account. Clear evidence supporting this view was found within the research data in September, in the statement from principal teacher D,

"Assessment data reflects the performance of the class teacher."

This principal teacher took the information from the STACS data at "face value" without questioning its validity. This could have been due to the fact that this participant had been in post for only three years, and was perhaps reluctant to question the provenance of official data. Another explanation might be that this focus on teacher performance was reinforced by the head teacher, as the principal teacher D went on to explain,

"STACS data is complicated, and usually interpreted for me by the head teacher."

Data from the head teacher interview confirmed that his focus was primarily on the performance of principal teachers, where external exam data was used as a measurement tool.

External examination data is used in Scottish schools as a basis for setting targets at school level, in performance (career) reviews. Principal teachers then analyse the data, which should, theoretically, inform the departmental development plan. However, evidence from the research data indicates that this may not be the situation within the case study school, as principal teacher A explained,

"Has analysis of STACS data affected development planning? ... realistically ... no!"

Principal teacher C reinforced this view,

"How much use have I made of STACS in development planning? ... none whatsoever!"

In September 2007, the education authority of the case study school provided all principal teachers with a form on which to record a detailed, departmental analysis of STACS data to inform development planning. The authority emphasised that this was a necessary part of an "auditable paper trail", ensuring the professional accountability of principal teachers. Power (1994:19) draws attention to this by proposing,

"What is being assured is the quality of control systems, rather than the quality of first order operations. In such a context, accountability is discharged by demonstrating the existence of such systems of control, not by demonstrating good teaching."

Power's "accountability being discharged by demonstrating the existence of such systems of control" is highlighted by principal teacher E, who revealed,

"I've taken time to look at the STACS results, and bearing in mind I'm obliged to treat them in a certain way, and report upon them in a certain way..I do so dutifully."

5.5.2 Accountability of Principal Teachers for 'Pupil Success'

The research data indicated that principal teachers feel an "obligation" to analyse STACS data, even if they do not feel it to be of any practical use. Principal teacher C felt that all staff were held accountable for the outcomes of STACS data each year, and that this was "held over them". This perceived measure of teacher performance

by the head teacher and education authority, was viewed by participants as having a direct influence on future promotion, secondment opportunities, and general professional progress.

Principal teacher A felt that the new "XL" course was a "different type of subject" involving a different type of accountability; that of the achievement of life skills by individual pupils, rather than the generation of good exam grades.

The case study school is situated within a small, isolated rural community, and good external exam results reinforce the professional status of the principal teacher both within the school, and perhaps more importantly, within the local community.

The data also revealed a strong purposive incentive, where personal satisfaction was gained from achieving targets set for pupils, and seeing them do well (Scott, 1998).

5.6 Final Summary of the Theme of 'Accountability'

A hierarchal system of accountability within a formal model of management, exists within the case study school. The research data indicates that the increased accountability of principal teachers through the process of development planning, reduces autonomy and increases the tension between "authentic" and "performance" practices.

The research evidence suggests that principal teachers within the case study school are exhibiting ritualistic compliance with the procedures of development planning, STACS analysis and self-evaluation in order to satisfy the demands of accountability within a hierarchal system. This was a state of affairs which was recognised by the head teacher. Within the hierarchal structure, accountability upwards from principal

teachers to the senior management team was evident. However, there was significantly less evidence of accountability of class teachers to principal teachers.

Subject principal teachers interpreted accountability for pupil needs as being the "efficient allocation of resources", whereas principal teachers of pastoral care interpreted this as the support needed to improve the skills of individual pupils.

The analysis of external examination data is regarded by principal teachers within the case study school, as a way of holding principal teachers to account for their personal professional performance, rather than a measure of pupil progress.

The emphasis within the case study school, is firmly on accountability in terms of meeting performance targets. This provides evidence perhaps, for the commodification of education. Prioritising the meeting of performance targets in terms of accountability, results in a focus on only those learning and teaching activities which will yield the highest return, in terms of pupil attainment. This may currently be seen within the case study school where specific target grades for external examinations are 'negotiated' with individual pupils twice per term. Learning and teaching strategies are subsequently selected in order to meet those targets successfully.

Accountability for performance is, according to the research data, perceived by principal teachers to be distinctly different from accountability for individual needs. Accountability for performance is seen primarily in terms of the completion of documentation by a target date. Whereas, accountability for individual needs is perceived to mean knowledge of individual pupils, and putting in place those learning and teaching practices which will improve the chances of success. Here the specific learning requirements of individual pupils are the principal focus, to enable them to

successfully access the curriculum. This may be seen in 'authentic practices' such as selecting teaching approaches which benefit individual pupils. Pressure to meet performance targets is replaced by encouragement to develop personal strengths.

Within the case study school, accountability through 'performance practices' of development planning, self-evaluation, career review and so on, are valued by the head teacher and adhered to by principal teachers. However, the school is becoming less and less effective, in terms of its position within the league tables of external examination results. The possible reasons for this apparent failure of performance mechanisms to drive forward school improvement, will be considered in the concluding chapter.

Theme of 'Performance'

5.7 Introduction

The theme of 'performance' was identified within the research data, through the collation of those codes which referred to performance practices undertaken by principal teachers such as development planning, self-evaluation, class observation, career review and the analysis of external examination data (STACS). The theme of 'performance' is considered within the categories of 'performance practice' which indicates those procedures carried out by principal teachers in order to meet the demands of performance, particularly in terms of pupil attainment and ultimately, the position of the school within the examination league tables. 'Authentic practice', which may be regarded as those procedures which primarily fulfil the needs of individual pupils, and 'integrated practice', those more ambiguous procedures which are difficult to classify as either 'performance' or 'authentic' practices.

Further evidence will be sought for the difference in professional practice between subject and pastoral care principal teachers, together with confirmation of a hierarchal system of accountability, and the lack of effect of market mechanisms within the case study school.

The theme of "performance" will then be discussed with reference to quality assurance in section 5.7.2, followed by a consideration of the use and validity of STACS data in section 5.7.3. This will be followed by a discussion of departmental development planning in section 5.7.4, followed by a final summary of the theme of "performance" in section 5.7.5.

5.7.1 Summary of Theme of "Performance"

Principal teachers are, to a large extent, held accountable to their line manager, for their performance in terms of pupil attainment, through the completion of self-evaluation procedures as contained in the HMIE document "How Good is Our School? 3" (HGIOS 3). Principal teachers must rate the performance of their department in all teaching and management areas using a scale from 1 (unsatisfactory), to 6 (excellent), and provide substantive evidence to confirm the rating allocated. Being held to account in this way may be considered stressful for principal teachers, and results in a great deal of time and effort being spent on self-evaluation at the expense of more 'authentic' practice, which considers the needs of individual pupils. (Staff absence records indicate that there is an increased rate of absence amongst principal teachers in May, when self evaluation procedures are carried out.) However, it may also be regarded perhaps, as an opportunity for principal teachers to be able to reflect upon their own professional practice. With

increasing emphasis on the role of distributed leadership in school improvement, perhaps a different approach to accountability for performance will have to be adopted in the future, through the devolution of responsibility for school improvement to teachers.

In May of the school year, self-evaluation procedures using quality indicators from the HMIE document HGIOS 3 are carried out by all departments, prior to submission of the departmental development plan to the head teacher.

Principal teacher C felt that this was a good time of year to look at self-evaluation procedures, as senior pupils were out of school on exam leave, leaving teachers with increased non-contact time.

"... staff have the space to be more reflective, and I have time to do the actual planning."

The purpose of self-evaluation using QI's in HGIOS2 and other quality assurance procedures such as class observation, and monitoring of pupil's work, is ostensibly to improve the learning experience of pupils, and to empower teachers. Perhaps self-evaluation is simply a government device to ensure good performance and continual teacher improvement.

There is generally amongst principal teachers within the case study school, an apathy towards self-evaluation procedures. The research data indicates that principal teachers feel self evaluation is a mechanism of holding them to account, rather than a spur to improvement of learning and teaching. Perhaps this is because teachers are continually required to alter their administrative and organisational systems, pedagogy, curriculum content, resources, technology and assessment procedures. In

so doing, they are required to acknowledge their professional "inadequacies" (Apple, 1981,1987).

Through the vehicle of the school development plan, imposed changes are introduced to remedy deficiencies in teachers alongside self-evaluation procedures, and to help teachers "develop" and improve. These imposed changes have origins in a variety of factors such as economic trends, historical events, political party in power, social and cultural developments, demographic trends or technological advances.

The completion of self-evaluation procedures by principal teachers is intended to highlight any weaknesses in provision which may ultimately affect pupil attainment. These weaknesses once identified are intended, according to the Education Authority, to appear as priorities on the next department development plan.

Principal teacher B revealed that S4 pupils were achieving low grades in the Knowledge and Understanding element of a Standard Grade course. This weakness was addressed through the production of new revision notes. When asked during the interview if this weakness was detected as a result of self-evaluation procedures, principal teacher B stated,

"My answer is I honestly can't tell you!"

The research data revealed inconsistencies in the interpretation and use of self-evaluation procedures within departments across the school. Although the HGIOS documentation was completed in May, the process of self-evaluation according to principal teachers was not continuous throughout the year, although that they felt perhaps it should be. Longer serving principal teachers claimed not to use the QI's in HGIOS 2 as a means of identifying areas of development need within departments, instead relying on professional experience and "instinct". The exception to this view

was principal teacher D who had been in post for three years, with perhaps less experience as a middle manager to draw upon, who relied heavily upon the framework of self-evaluation procedures.

All principal teachers interviewed, stated that self-evaluation documents are completed in May, primarily to fulfil the demands of the head teacher. This was an expectation of all principal teachers by the head teacher at this time. One reported that his priority was simply to commit 'something to paper' by the deadline date.

A review of the HGIOS2 self-evaluation returns for all departments in 2007-08, revealed that within the five point scale where Grade 5 is excellent and Grade 1 is unsatisfactory, principal teachers used only Grades 3,4,and 5 to indicate current progress within pupil attainment. Grades 1 and 2 were not used within the self-evaluation process. The majority of principal teachers rated their current level within pupil attainment at Grade 4 or 5, very good and excellent, despite external examination results continuing to decline. The reason for this could be that principal teachers are taking a more subjective rather than objective approach to self-evaluation, in an effort to complete the procedure by a specified deadline.

Fitz-Gibbon (1996) draws attention to the corrupting effects of QI's, and provides examples of how they can tempt people to distort them, or adopt behaviours which may be contrary to the desired impact of improved quality. This was evident within the case study school, where principal teachers stated that learning and teaching was approached in terms of HGIOS, in order simply to complete self-evaluation requirements. This took the form of selecting those learning and teaching methods which resulted in a higher rating when using QI's , rather than addressing the needs of individual pupils. It may be speculated that principal teachers were being driven by the demand of accountability for pupil performance, illustrated by the focus on

'performance practice', rather than the needs of pupils themselves ('authentic practice').

This perhaps provides an illustration of the use of self-evaluation procedures being another mechanism to ensure compliance with the demands of performance within the quasi-market of education. There is a danger that the potential benefits of the self-evaluation process to pupil attainment, could be lost if principal teachers are concentrating on the process itself, rather than on the outcomes. The approach to quality assurance within the case study school will be discussed in the following section.

5.7.2 Quality Assurance

There is a constant pressure upon principal teachers within the case study school, to quality assure pupil attainment. This takes the form of 'performance practices' such as self-evaluation using quality indicators, class observation and the analysis of both internal and external assessment data. A quantitative measure of pupil performance within a school, is provided by an analysis of external examination data (STACS). This data may be used to compare the performance of departments within a school, performance between comparator schools, and performance of a school nationally resulting in a league table position. The performance of a department within a school reflects by association, the performance of the principal teacher. Within the case study school, 'quality assurance' is generally regarded as the analysis of external examination data.

Quality Assurance was viewed as distinct from self-evaluation procedures by principal teachers in September of the school year. This may be influenced by the publication of external examination data (STACS) at this time of year. Referring to the quality assurance practice of analysing STACS data, principal teacher E stated,

"It allows me to reflect as a professional and unearth issues that need to be brought up in future development plans. It is part of the evaluation process, the whole quality assurance cycle. From that we can plan to improve upon an aspect that has come out as a result of STACS analysis ..."

The research data indicated that principal teachers had very different interpretations of the meaning of the term "quality assurance". Principal teacher C referring to her interpretation of the meaning of the term "quality assurance" stated,

"It's more an accountability issue at the moment, pulling together everything we discussed in May at departmental level. Its now putting it in a format to report back up the line, it's a line management issue."

This statement appears to reinforce the notion that the quality assurance policy reinforces the hierarchal structure and therefore the formal model of management within the school.

Principal teacher A framed the meaning of "quality assurance" as a question,

"Is the best use being made of staff? If the best use is not being made of staff, how can I make it better?"

A different perspective of quality assurance was given by principal teacher B,

"Quality assurance has little meaning for me at present. I would question the validity of STACS data. It is more difficult to put pupils onto courses when influenced by

statistics, external grades for example. Teachers will not accept weak pupils onto courses, as they want to look good in the statistics."

The evidence from the research data indicates that the principal teachers interviewed within the case study school, were adopting 'performance practice' as a result of quality assurance procedures, apart from principal teacher B who demonstrated 'authentic practice', putting the needs of individual pupils first and foremost. Evidence for this was found within the September interview with principal teacher B,

"Teachers are frustrated because they don't think they should have a pupil with that poor an ability, or they see a pupil maybe presenting behaviours on the Autistic Spectrum that they don't want in class, and may not be willing to adjust their teaching. Two years ago an autistic pupil had a lot of difficulties and this pupil had a meltdown. Teachers were not going to have that pupil in their class. Well, now that pupil is in all subjects and coping. We are perceived as speaking up for people whom other people see in a negative light. We know that we are not going to get brilliant results, and it will affect STACS and all the rest of it ... but for that pupil, it was a really great achievement."

The head teacher had a different perspective of quality assurance, when he stated,

"Quality assurance for me is a way for teachers, principal teachers and senior managers to determine how close to excellence we are."

This statement perhaps reinforces the head teacher's expectation that all staff should be routinely carrying out quality assurance practices. The head teacher response frequency chart 17 in Chapter 4, indicated that his principal focus was on 'performance' rather than 'authentic' or 'integrated' practices. He perceived the main function of quality assurance being improvement in the professional practice of

principal teachers, which would ultimately result in the improvement in pupil attainment.

5.7.3 The Use and Validity of STACS Data

Within the case study school, the performance of pupils and principal teachers is measured using external examination data. This data is returned to schools from the Scottish Government in the form of Standard Tables and Charts (STACS) data. This is interpreted for the school by a statistician, who presents the information to staff in a more 'user friendly' form. Within this data set, the main areas of interest to teachers are the levels of attainment in each subject year on year, the position of the school compared to ten comparator schools, and relative ratings showing the performance of individual departments within the school in terms of attainment.

According to Hoskins (1979:137),

"Written performance and written records make it possible to generate a "history" of each student, and also classify students "en masse" into categories. This new form of power locates each of us in a place in society, and because it is a technique of knowledge, we overlook the fact that it is simultaneously a technique of power."

Formal assessment of pupils therefore imposes its own values on the activities it regulates. This means that the process can have unintended and indeed dysfunctional consequences. As previously suggested, this may be seen in the practice of principal teachers, focusing on external examination data in both May and June of the academic year.

It appears, within the case study school, that principal teachers are spending a great deal of their time throughout the school academic year, making sure they simply complete the process of performance monitoring through development planning, self-evaluation, and analysis of assessment data. The focus is on the *process* rather than on the outcomes, in order to satisfy the demands of performativity. This appears to occur, according to the research data, at the expense of 'authentic' learning and teaching practices, and it may be speculated, the reason for the continuing decline in school performance as a whole.

Power (1997:2) observes,

"Before the education system becomes even more fatally infected with the contagion of "performativity" and its symptoms of pervasive judgement and comparison, there is a pressing need to articulate evidence from the research of the limitations of educational assessment. There is a need to demonstrate that assessment is a social process that affects the quality of an individual's capacity to learn."

Cowie, Taylor and Croxford (2006:2) suggest that STACS data provide a narrow focus on academic attainment and measure only that which is easy to measure. Principal teacher C had a similar view, when referring to examination data states,

"... the easy one to measure in a way, just from end of unit tests, exams and so on. Of course education is a lot more than that ..."

Cowie et.al. continue that STACS data is used primarily to hold teachers to account. Evidence for this view within the case study school may be found in the following statement from principal teacher C,

"... it's very complex. I'm quite suspicious of it because ... is it there to represent a particular angle? Is it there to analyse what we have achieved? There's bound to be a

comparison made with how we are at the start. Then it begs the question "are we to be measured against that?" I'm a little bit wary of it."

STACS data is generally used in Scottish schools as a basis for setting targets at school level in performance reviews. Principal teachers together with their faculty heads analyse the data and set targets for specific groups of pupils in order to raise attainment. However, is it possible to raise the attainment of the next cohort of pupils using historic data? Perhaps not, as principal teacher B observes,

"We do look at them (STACS data), and we can look back and say 'our S4 did better this year than they did last year.' What you can't tell though, is what was that down to? Was it down to better teaching? Better materials? A better bunch of S4 pupils than in other Authorities? So I am a little sceptical about STACS data!"

Underpinning many current assessment initiatives, notably the reporting of results in comparative league tables, is also the assumption that competition between both individuals and institutions is a valuable spur to improvement. It is important to note however, that school league tables are not formally published in Scotland by the Scottish Government. The use of external examination data to position schools within league tables makes implicit the assumption that it is possible to measure quality, by applying the criteria to the available evidence, and that it is both appropriate and desirable to express the resulting judgement in a categoric form. These categories may take the form of grades, marks, ranks, or percentages. They do however, all share the same underlying rationale, that it is meaningful to compare some aspect of quality on a common scale. This may raise questions regarding the validity of STACS data as a measure of individual pupil attainment, and as a tool to position schools within a league table. Principal teacher C commented that the position of the case study school compared to ten similar comparator schools was not valid as the results were

"skewed" if there were a low number of candidates entered. Principal teacher C continued,

"... STACS data takes no account of each particular cohort, and quantitative data can only provide a very small part of a complex picture."

Principal teacher B commented that the analysis of STACS data was of no benefit to pupils with additional support needs, and therefore in her view was not valid. Perhaps this was because in the pastoral care department there was greater emphasis on achievement of qualitative skills, rather than on quantitative measurement, a mentioned previously.

The validity of STACS data was also questioned by principal teacher D who explained,

"... STACS data is analysed for my department by the head teacher. However, there are too many variables within the data to be able to draw any valid conclusions."

Contrary to the opinion of three out of five principal teachers that analysis of STACS data has limited use, the head teacher stated,

"On a scale of one to ten, STACS would rate eleven in terms of usefulness."

Perhaps this disjunction between the views of three out of five principal teachers, and the head teacher regarding STACS data, may be explained by their respective positions within the hierarchal model of management. Principal teachers seem to feel, that the use of STACS data is used as a lever to hold them to account. The head teacher however, seems to favour STACS data as a way of applying pressure to principal teachers to improve their performance.

With the continuing emphasis on the analysis of STACS data being key to improvement in pupil attainment, there is a continuing assumption that the capacity

for an individual to improve in terms attainment is both limitless and measurable. Ball (2001) suggests that,

"Measures of performance have become separated from the lived reality and experience in which teaching and learning takes place."

There is evidence to support this view in the previous statements by principal teachers C, A, and D who collectively question the validity of external exam data which neglects to focus on pupils as individuals, measure what is important to pupils, and includes many variables which do not link directly to the context of learning and teaching within the case study school.

Other principal teachers highlighted more positive aspects of STACS data analysis. Principal teacher B noted that although exam data analysis did not directly inform the departmental development plan, it was useful in the identification of weak areas within learning and teaching, which could subsequently be improved to the benefit of pupils in the classroom.

Principal teacher E commented,

"Analysis of external results provides sound empirical evidence of pupil attainment, and aids professional reflection."

Perhaps this principal teacher adopted a positive stance on the use of empirical evidence as a measure of pupil attainment, due to working with quantitative, measurable computer skills within learning and teaching.

Departmental development planning was a common theme in May and September of the school year, however this research revealed no evidence of a direct link between the analysis of STACS data and the process of development planning within the case study school. This lack of linkage may indicate compliance with the procedures of development planning and data analysis, rather than on the outcomes they generate.

This again provides another example of 'performance practice' amongst principal teachers within the case study school.

5.7.4 Departmental Development Planning

The research data indicated that departmental development plans were not significantly influenced by the school development plan or the analysis of STACS data, but mainly by individual departmental priorities such as resources. As previously discussed in section 5.4.2, Ball (1994) refers to the school development plan as a device for achieving change and asserting control. The departmental development plan may be regarded as a way of holding principal teachers to account. The fact that the research data suggested that the school development plan had little influence on departmental development planning, may indicate a resistance to this means of accountability amongst principal teachers, and an attempt to retain a certain level of autonomy. Principal teachers appear to be complying simply with the procedure of development planning, illustrating 'performance practice'.

The head teacher, when discussing departmental development planning, made no reference to the link with the school development plan. Principal teacher B stated,

"I have to put in my development plan two things this year. First, to cut down the amount of paper we are using for the options process, so this year the options booklets were published on the school website, and if anyone wanted a CD they were also available."

Principal teacher C confirmed this focus of the development plan on resources and learning and teaching,

"... the main purpose of the development plan is to provide an appropriate curriculum."

There was some evidence of the lack of influence of the school development plan on the department development plan through what may be described as "fabricated compliance". Following completion of the departmental development plan, principal teacher C remarked,

"... the next point is to have a look at the list (priorities of the school development plan) ticking off what we think has applied to us."

The research data revealed that principal teacher D attempted to match quality indicators (QI's) from HGIOS 2, to departmental needs, then fitting in the priorities of the school development plan wherever possible.

Principal teachers C, D, and E stated that they referred to the development plan throughout the year, although there was no evidence within the research data to support this.

Within the case study school, the school development plan is prepared by the senior management team according first to the priorities set down by the education authority, and second, to those of the whole school. This draft is then presented for discussion at a principal teachers' meeting, where *minor* alterations may be made. The next stage is presentation of the draft to all staff at a faculty meeting for discussion, following which any changes to the document are rarely made. This perhaps may be viewed as a false collegiality, where senior managers 'go through the motions' of consultation. This may partly explain why the research data indicated that the school development plan had little or no influence on departmental development planning.

According to Stoll, Fink and Earl (2003), as members of a school community interact, discussing all the information and data they have, they interpret it communally, and distribute it amongst themselves. It is this inclusive, evidence based, enquiry orientated process of creating a school development plan, that is as important as the actual product. Perhaps more opportunities for staff to engage in professional discussion of the school development plan beyond the twice yearly faculty meetings, and actively contribute to its construction, would make it more meaningful in development planning. The research data suggests that there is a tension between the requirements of the school development plan and departmental development plans, with principal teachers main focus being on their own departmental priorities. This is illustrated in the comment from principal teacher C,

"It would be quite good I think, not that it is going to happen, to say let's have a year where we can just concentrate on department needs rather than on national or local priorities."

There was evidence to indicate that principal teachers prepared their development plans in isolation, with no referral to other department development plans which are freely available on the school network. It seemed therefore that departments within the school were moving in different directions, unaware of the priorities of colleagues in adjoining classrooms. The suggestion by the researcher that perhaps principal teachers *should* look at other departments development plans was met with a positive response. Following consideration of this suggestion, principal teacher E remarked,

"Departments can post their development plans on the server, and if you are really nosey, you can go and have a look at them. That's an ad hoc system. Maybe it should be a bit more structured, where we could agree as colleagues ... let's take time out

and discuss development plans as a school development process. Build it into the calendar."

Principal teacher E went on to explain the possible benefits of this process,

"... sharing good practice, and if there are issues you are worrying about and not sure how to cope, eureka! There's someone else in the school that is managing it quite well, so we can share methodologies and strategies again. The staff are our greatest resource, let's get communicating. It's back to communication!"

The other principal teachers within the research study, all agreed that consulting other departments development plans would be helpful, although in practice they felt there was no time for them to do this. The head teacher commented that consulting other department's development plans would be a good idea, and commented,

"You have to believe that people can learn...are willing to learn from each other. Steal other people's ideas ... which is certainly what I do you know. I look at other schools' service improvement plans."

Another factor perhaps to consider which may be important in establishing the importance of the school development plan to principal teachers in development planning, is its link with self-evaluation and other quality assurance procedures as part of the quality assurance cycle. Within the case study school, the research evidence suggested that this link was tenuous, and subsequently it was difficult to identify any institutional improvement that had taken place as a direct result of development planning, a further illustration of Power's point regarding the lack of impact on front line service provision of many quality assurance systems, and is perhaps an important area for future research.

5.7.5 Final Summary

The theme of 'performance' emerged from the interview data through the collation of all codes generated, which related to 'performance practices' such as development planning, self-evaluation, class observation, STACS analysis and career review.

The purpose of self-evaluation and other quality assurance procedures, is to improve the learning experiences of pupils and empower teachers. However, within the case study school, there is evidence of apathy amongst principal teachers towards these procedures. It may be speculated that principal teachers are simply complying with quality assurance procedures, in order to satisfy the demands of performance within the quasi-market of education.

There is evidence of 'loose coupling' between the analysis of STACS data and self-evaluation procedures. The link between them is tenuous, perhaps providing evidence of principal teachers adopting 'performance practice', rather than using the analysis of STACS data to influence development planning.

The head teacher however, viewed the analysis of STACS data as being very useful, perhaps as a way of holding principal teachers to account for their professional performance, and applying pressure for them to improve.

Research evidence suggested that within the case study school, development planning was not significantly influenced by the school development plan. This might be perhaps due to principal teachers trying to retain autonomy within the development planning procedure by putting their department priorities first, rather than the demands of the school development plan.

Within the theme of 'performance', it is apparent that principal teachers are spending significant time on complying with the *process* of performance practices such as quality assurance, in order to satisfy the demands of performativity. Performance practices would appear to have priority in favour of 'authentic practices' involved in learning and teaching, together with meeting the needs of the individual pupil.

Theme of 'Management'

5.8 Introduction

Following the discussion of the main themes of "accountability" and "performance" generated by analysis of the research data, the third and final theme of "management" will now be discussed, presenting research evidence for the existence of "authentic practice", "performance practice" and "integrated practice" amongst principal teachers of the case study school, together with confirmation of the effects of a hierarchal system of accountability. Evidence will also be revealed for the differing impacts of management practice on principal teachers of pastoral care and subjects. A summary of the findings within this theme will be presented in section 5.8.1, followed by an analysis of aspects of performance which impact on the management of departments within the case study school in section 5.8.2. The management of people and change, will be considered respectively in sections 5.8.3 and 5.8.4, followed by the impact of the performance management practice of career review, on the departmental management practices of principal teachers. This will be followed by a discussion of the monitoring of teachers through class observation, and provision of CPD in section 5.8.6.

The management of budget and resources, followed by a discussion of administration issues will follow respectively in section 5.8.7 and 5.8.8. Finally, a summary of the theme of management will be presented in section 5.8.9.

5.8.1 Summary of the Theme of 'Management'

The themes common to both the May and September interview data were (i) the management of people and (ii) the management of change. Both themes have contributed to answering the research question,

"How do performance management practices impact on the professional practice of Principal Teachers, specifically within the areas of learning and teaching and departmental management?"

Both sets of research data in May and September revealed that principal teachers viewed learning and teaching through the perspective of the 'management of people' which may be regarded perhaps as an example of 'integrated practice', where people may be managed according to their needs, or in order to maximise their performance in terms of the achievement of specified targets. Within this perspective, there is a clear tension within the case study school, between the organisational demands of performance and the individual needs of people (Riches, 1997). Kydd (1996:17) suggests 'performance' may be regarded as the accomplishment of a task, where accomplishment is viewed in terms of efficiency or effectiveness, and may be regarded as 'performance practice' amongst principal teachers.

Performance 'efficiency' may be regarded as the 'real' cost for a given level of achievement, whereas performance 'effectiveness' may be regarded as the extent to

which a particular measurable target is achieved. The 'pursuit of excellence' (maximising teacher performance), was a priority of principal teachers according to the research data, which was in conflict with the identification of the need for a collegial approach towards the effective management of people. The research data indicated that principal teachers felt there was no time for professional discussion with colleagues, due in part to the demands of performativity.

The perception of principal teachers appeared to be, that as they were personally accountable for their professional performance through quality assurance procedures, they were 'on their own' when trying to attain performance targets. There was also a perceived lack of time within the school day, to pursue a collegial approach.

This provided further evidence for a disjunction between 'authentic' and 'performance' practice of principal teachers within the case study school. The senior management team of the school continually promote collegiality through staff and principal teacher meetings, but it appears that the current model of management within the school does not provide opportunities for professional dialogue between colleagues. Indeed, performance management practices within the school seemed to reinforce the formal model of management, within a culture of managerialism, which in turn relied heavily upon a hierarchal accountability structure, particularly amongst subject principal teachers.

According to the research data, principal teacher A, with responsibility for pastoral care, was not under the same performance pressure as subject principal teachers, perhaps because there is less emphasis on the measurable attainment of pupils, and greater emphasis on accountability to pupils and parents, rather than a line manager. The implication here is that the hierarchal structure of accountability is reinforced within subject principal teachers, through the measurement of pupil performance in

examinations. This in turn has an effect of the relationships between principal teachers, their staff and pupils. It may be argued that the central tenet of good management, is the strength of relationships between people. To extrapolate this idea further, perhaps it may even be speculated that principal teachers of pastoral care are more effective managers.

5.8.2 Aspects of Performativity Which Impact on the Management of Departments.

Performance management practices had significant impact on the management of departments through the process of career review of staff, and the management of budget and resources in May of the school year.

Riches (1994a) identifies perhaps a positive aspect of career review, which is that it is a process which can identify individual motivating factors, strengthened in turn by the support of the principal teacher. The research data indicated that this was the perspective of career review favoured by principal teachers within the case study school. This is illustrated by the comment from principal teacher E regarding a recent department meeting,

"Career review was one that we discussed yesterday. There was a feeling that career reviews should happen more frequently."

There was evidence within the data to indicate that the departmental budgets were resource driven, as opposed to being driven by the needs of individual pupils, perhaps as a result of the pressure on principal teachers to continually improve overall pupil attainment. There appears to be a perception amongst principal teachers, that the purchase of resources will have a proportional effect on pupil attainment.

In September of the school year, there seemed to be less performance pressure on principal teachers in terms of management, but more emphasis on administrative tasks, particularly timetabling, due to pupils changing courses following the results of SQA examinations.

The monitoring of class teachers' professional practice was, according to the research data, a performance activity that took up a significant amount of principal teachers' time in September of the school year. There appeared to be a perceived need to ensure a *consistent* standard of lesson delivery, to achieve high levels of attainment within a department. This reinforces the observation by Harris (1997) that the result of performance management is to de-professionalize and de-skill teachers in a search for models of technical effectiveness. However, evidence from the case study school suggested that principal teachers are adopting a supportive, mentoring approach to teacher monitoring, perhaps reflecting "authentic' rather than "performance" practice." This is confirmed by principal teacher D who states,

"Well, your staff is your greatest resource you know, and not to invest in your staff is counter productive. I value my staff very highly and it's important they are given as much support as possible. I think the annual staff review has been very helpful, tying into CPD opportunities. Support your staff, ensure they get training opportunities and support in daily learning and teaching practice is important".

Principal teacher D continues,

"I think it's about a team approach. We're all in there together, it's about valuing and empowering them, all the things that make them feel worthwhile, needed and appreciated."

When considering the meaning of 'management' in education, it is difficult to provide an accurate definition as the perceived meanings of the terms *policy, management* and

administration within the context of education are both ambiguous and varied. Perspectives on management within Scottish education have been previously discussed in Chapter 2.

Glatter (1979) suggests that educational policy is concerned with relationships of power, influence and control within the educational system, as illustrated by 'performance practice', whereas *management* is concerned with the internal operation of educational institutions. As this is dependant upon relationships between people, it may be regarded as 'authentic practice'. For the purposes of this research, the definition proposed by Glatter has been adopted. Administration is seen by Glatter as the completion of low order, routine tasks such as completing paperwork, record keeping, filing and so on.

Caldwell and Spinks (1998) suggest that 'leadership' is a distinct component of organisational effectiveness, which should be differentiated from both management and administration. The requirement for leaders within education to have a vision for the department or school as a whole, and be able to communicate this vision to others is linked with effective schools and school improvement. The head teacher stated,

"It is clear in my mind that a principal teacher is both a leader and manager within their department."

The research data indicated that principal teachers had a perhaps "managerialist" focus in running their departments, which centred around the perspectives of management and administration, but made no direct reference to the importance of leadership. Leadership can perhaps be considered as an example of 'integrated practice', where leadership towards goals of performance could be interpreted as 'performance practice', and leadership in terms of building relationships between people could be interpreted as 'authentic practice'.

5.8.3 Management of People

Principal teachers within both research groups in May and September of the school year, referred to the "pursuit of excellence" as being the main goal in the effective management of people. Further questioning revealed this to mean the optimisation of teacher performance, resulting in higher attainment in pupils, providing a clear example of 'performance practice'.

However, a collegiate approach was regarded as being necessary for the successful implementation of change, and for the effective management of learning and teaching. This provides an example of 'authentic practice' amongst principal teachers. This is illustrated by principal teacher E who reflects,

"You can't really isolate staff from learning and teaching because the impact of the quality of learning and teaching emanates from the delivery of your staff. So well supported staff will respond hopefully in a positive way in terms of what you do in the classroom."

Riches (1997) highlights the tension between the organisational demands for performance, and the needs of individuals within an organisation. This suggests an ethical divergence between the behaviour of managers and the freedom of individuals to work autonomously. However, Leiberman (1986:210) draws attention to the plain fact that,

"Schools cannot be improved without people working together."

Mortimore et.al. (1988) suggest the term "collegiality" is concerned with the purposeful leadership of staff by the head teacher, the involvement of all teachers in decision making, and consistency within teaching approaches.

Within the case study school, principal teachers felt that the main requirement for a collegial approach was to have time provided within the working day, in order to engage in professional discussion and reflection. However, this was not the case as principal teacher C observed,

"... I find there is very little time for reflection because of the pace we are now working at throughout the year."

If a collegial approach is the most effective way to manage people within the case study school, and principal teachers are requesting time for professional discussion, this could perhaps be provided by the head teacher. Campbell and Southworth (1985) suggest that head teachers feel collegiality decentralises authority within a school, which in turn can affect the head teacher's professional identity. There is perhaps some indication of this from the head teacher who commented,

"I have to be aware of the issue of professionalism, independence and the opportunity to make your own decisions. You have to convince people that this (the introduction of school priorities) is going to benefit everyone. If you just go off and do your own thing then ... "

Collegiality runs counter to the notion that decision making in schools is 'zoned', where the teacher decides what happens in the classroom, and the head teacher decides on school policy (Lortie 1969, Coulson 1978).

The observation by Packwood (1984) and Campbell (1985) that working with colleagues and being expected to give a lead, expands the work of the teacher, and teaching becomes a dual role. This seems to be the situation within the case study school amongst principal teachers, and is aptly described by the principal teacher E who observes,

"... One has to know, what are the ways in which your staff tick? What makes them positive? ... that's a skill as a manager; to make sure you interact with your colleagues in a way in which they feel comfortable and relaxed. So 'man management' skills are really important. I think it's about a team approach. We're all in there together. It's about valuing and empowering them. All the things that make them feel worthwhile, needed and appreciated."

Evidence from the research data at both times within the academic year, seems to support the view of Bush (1986), that democracy and hierarchy; participation and control; together with leadership and collaboration, do not sit easily aside each other. This might account for the rhetoric regarding collegiality as being an essential element in the management of people within the case study school, but a distinct lack of organisational structure to enable it to be effectively addressed.

Research within the case study school revealed the predominant form of organisational management to be that of the 'formal model'', which could directly affect both the management of people, and management of change within the school. Although there is a move towards distributed leadership, this is being impeded by the formal model of management within the school.

5.8.4 Management of Change

The evidence from the research data revealed the main focus for the management of change by principal teachers, to be the improvement of learning and teaching reflecting 'authentic practice'. This could involve the management of changes in pedagogy within the department, resources used, and effective deployment of staff for example. The effectiveness of the management of change, is influenced by the model

of organisational management that exists within the school together with leadership, according to the outcomes of the principal teacher interviews.

The formal model of management that exists within the case study school is characterised by a hierarchal system of accountability that positions the class teacher at the foot, and the head teacher at the apex.

According to Bush (1986:35)

"The flow of information is down the hierarchy, and is dependant on the acceptance of a policy, plan, or decision at the top."

While formal authority resides with head teachers and principal teachers, they still require the consent of colleagues, if policy initiatives are to be carried through into classroom practices (Wallace and Hall, 1994). A perceived weakness in this perspective within the formal model that operates within the case study school was revealed in the interview of principal teacher A. This referred to the need for change in the pedagogy of class teachers, in order to meet more effectively, the needs of pupils requiring support.

"We have a whole school remit, trying to ensure that ... this is going to be very difficult to put ... we have a remit to ensure that all staff know what is the most appropriate form of delivery for students. However, that is extremely problematic and challenging, because each department is it's own department, and each teacher it's own teacher, and teachers can choose not to avail themselves of the information, although it shouldn't be optional."

The decision of teachers *not* to use information from the pastoral care department to change their pedagogical practice in order to support pupils with additional needs, is

identified as a primary weakness within the formal model by Bush (1995:46) who states,

"Decision making is not rational. Professional judgement is based as much on the expertise of the individual, as on the rational processes according to the rule book."

This illustrates that the dominant influence of the hierarchy within the formal model, is compromised by the expertise possessed by professional teachers. From the research data principal teacher A provides a further illustration,

"We are a service department. Although we do have pupils that we have courses for, we also get pupils fired down by management. Addressing their needs is sometimes ... for other people to make significant changes, which they may be unprepared to do."

A possible solution is proposed by Bush (1995; 48),

The rationality of the decision making process requires modification, to allow for the pace and complexity of change."

Although weaknesses exist in the formal model of management, as revealed within the research data, it remains valid perhaps as a partial descriptor of organisation and management within education.

The second factor influencing the management of change is *leadership.* According to Fullan (2001:45),

"The more complex society gets, the more sophisticated leadership must become. Complexity means change, but specifically it means rapidly occurring, unpredictable, non-linear change."

Four dimensions of leadership for sustainable improvement in schools are identified by Caldwell and Spinks (1992:94),

a) **Strategic** – discerning trends, and anticipating impact on education. Interpreting structures and processes to realise vision.

b) **Educational** – nurtures the learning community and develops knowledge management amongst staff. (Caldwell, 2000:2)

c) **Responsive** – responding to the expectations of stakeholders and acting upon them.

d) **Cultural** – the capacity to change the culture of the school.

Although principal teachers did not refer to leadership directly, but only to management issues during their respective interviews, evidence of specific dimensions of strategic and responsive leadership were apparent during the analysis of data.

From the research data generated in May and September of the school year, it was apparent that the most prevalent dimension of leadership amongst principal teachers was that of *strategic* leadership reflecting perhaps an emphasis on 'performance practice'. This was affected primarily through the process of development planning, where structures and processes were interpreted in order to impact positively on both departmental visions, and learning and teaching. An example of the strategic dimension of leadership within the school, is provided by principal teacher B (pastoral care),

"On Monday and Tuesday last week, all pastoral care staff were off timetable, and we completely redeveloped our PSE course for S1 – S4. That was on our development plan, and we have carried it out. The next stage is to get the bits of paper put into booklet form, so that we have a course up and running,"

However, principal teacher A (pastoral care) pursued a different dimension of leadership; that of *responsive* leadership where action was driven by a response to the expectations of pupils and parents, rather than by the interpretation of structures and processes. This was reflected in the differing perceptions of subject principal teachers and principal teacher A, to the issue of accountability.

Principal teachers C, D, and E felt that they were accountable in the first instance to their ' line manager', whereas principal teachers A and B stated that they were accountable to 'pupils and parents'. This indicated that principal teachers C,D,and E were responding directly to the demands of the head teacher, as opposed to those of pupils and parents.

The educational dimension of leadership was apparent through the authentic practice of principal teachers as identified within the research data, where the priority was to nurture the learning community through addressing the needs of individuals. The capacity to change the culture of the school is currently restricted to the head teacher within the hierarchal model of management, as the opportunity for distributed leadership is limited, inhibiting school improvement.

5.8.5 Career Review of Staff

Principal teachers focused on the career review of staff in May of the school year, perhaps because they had more time due to senior classes being out of school on exam leave. The process of career review involves the class teacher having a discussion with his or her principal teacher, about achievements to date, and areas in which improvements could be made. Targets are agreed between the teacher and principal teacher for the following year, including attendance at appropriate CPD courses.

Principal teacher E makes an interesting comparison between the process of career review, and the evaluation of staff using HGIOS 2,

"... I value my staff very highly, and it is important that they are seen to be given as much support as possible. For that, I think the annual staff review has been very helpful, tying into CPD opportunities. The kind of broad brush statements that HGIOS 2 give us in terms of resourcing and staff, is really too broad and cold."

Perhaps this reflects the view of Kydd (1996), that people achieve most if their personal dispositions are valued, understood and taken into account, when finding ways to maximise performance.

Within the case study school, this seems to be achieved through the process of career review. The observation that principal teacher E makes regarding the limitations of using QI's to measure the performance of teachers, is reinforced by Ronan and Prien (1971), who draw attention to the fact that teachers' performance is not consistent over time, cannot be reliably observed, and is moderated by the influence of leadership within an organisation.

Rogers and Badham (1994:107) perhaps indirectly support the mechanism of career review in assessing the individual performance of teachers, rather than using the QI's of HGIOS 2 when they state,

"QI's are not an absolute or general measure of performance."

The process of career review may also contribute towards teacher motivation, according to the context theory proposed by Riches (1994a), where identification of that which motivates the individual to work, may be strengthened through the provision of appropriate support by the principal teacher.

It is perhaps possible that the pressures of performance management have resulted in principal teachers focusing on career review in May of the school year, to allow appropriate CPD to be put in place for individual teachers, to ensure 'value for money' for the policy makers in the following school year.

A focus on career review at other times of the year, might have indicated a greater emphasis on the personal support and motivation of teachers, reflecting perhaps 'authentic' rather than the 'performance' practice of principal teachers. With reference to the process of career review, 'authentic practice' might be seen as identifying the needs of individual teachers to enhance their personal development. 'Performance practice' would perhaps focus on perceived professional weaknesses of teachers, and introduce remedial action in the form of CPD. 'Integrated practice' could involve for example the discussion of timetable preferences of teachers for the following year. This could be interpreted as providing teachers with the opportunity for personal growth ('authentic practice'), or making timetable recommendations to teachers, which would have a positive impact on the attainment of pupils the following year ('performance practice').

The research data indicated that career review was viewed by principal teachers from the perspective of performance, as references to career review within the interview transcripts were coded predominately under 'performance practice'.

As part of the staff appraisal system, principal teachers were focused in May of the school year, on monitoring the classroom practice of teachers, and providing appropriate CPD opportunities.

Barber et.al. (1995) suggest appraisal has made a major contribution to the identification of the development needs of staff, the effective targeting of resources,

and subsequent provision of appropriate CPD opportunities. Mahoney and Hextal (2001:177) describe staff appraisal as,

"A process that links people and jobs to the strategy and objectives of the organisation."

This may be done through the controlled provision of CPD, and could perhaps be regarded therefore, as a tool of performance management. Perhaps the work of teachers could be more effectively linked to the objectives of the organisation, by giving them greater responsibility for learning and teaching (distributed leadership) within a more collegial management structure. DuGay (1996) proposes that the workplace sets the framework and conditions in which the performance of teachers can be audited, measured and assessed. However, the process of appraisal through the observation of teachers is still regarded with suspicion in schools, illustrated by principal teacher A who states,

"We're party to quite a bit of information, and we have a very difficult job with classroom assistants and teachers, for not being perceived as a "spy in the camp". That's a very difficult thing, because sometimes we can perceive problems, and some may be to do with the way the curriculum is being delivered, and how I tackle that ... it's quite a tactful job."

Within the case study school, teaching is generally cast in terms of its direct and measurable impacts on achievement. Performance management depends on the adoption of an agreed model of "the preferred teacher" (Smyth, 2000).

Critiques of performance management cite it's capacity to de-professionalize and de-skill teachers in a search for models of technical effectiveness as a persistent feature (Harris, 1997).

Hyland (1993) observes that performance management programmes based on the functional analysis of work roles, are likely to produce teachers who are judged competent, but ill equipped for further professional development, uncritical of educational change, and largely ignorant of the wider cultural, social and political context. This may be due in part to the fact that CPD provision addresses only short-term goals, and is focused on improving pupil attainment. For example, within he case study school, CPD provision currently is provided on formative assessment, behaviour management and creative learning.

Gray (1998) suggests that a greater commitment to professional renewal, long-term professional development and an open dialogue involving all sectors of the education community, may challenge the distorting effects of performance management through the monitoring of teachers, and provision of short-term CPD opportunities, and encourage more 'authentic practice' rather than 'performance practice.'

As performance standards are generally relative to the expectations of an organisation, there is increasing emphasis on the role of principal teachers to negotiate and agree acceptable performance standards with class teachers. This is dependant on the quality of relationships between the principal teacher and classroom teacher, which in turn may be influenced by the model of management that exists within a school.

5.8.6 Management of Budget and Resources

Principal teachers reported that most of their time was taken up with budget and resource management, in May of the school year. Budget allocations were made to

departments on the 1st April, after which principal teachers were able to purchase resources for their departments. Strategic planning was prevalent in May, prioritising spending within the next departmental development plan.

Within the case study school, it appeared that management of the departmental budgets was resource, rather than education driven. This reflected perhaps the influence of performance management pressures such as development planning practices, which resulted in the adoption of 'performance practice'. This perspective was evident in the following statement from principal teacher B,

"We've focused on the departmental development plan and said, if we are going to tackle this area we will need books and data projectors. In the past year, the bulk of money has gone on that and less on consumables, paper and things."

Some reference was made in the research data to the planning aspect of the budget, namely how much money would be allocated to each item within the development plan. However, as each principal teacher throughout the school has complete autonomy in budget planning, there was subsequently no co-ordination of budgets across the school in order that they might meet organisational objectives. Perhaps this is because budget co-ordination between departments is not facilitated by the formal model of organisational management within the school. Principal teachers do not evaluate the previous year's development plan in order to compare expenditure with outcomes achieved (Everard and Morris 1996). This perhaps provides evidence that within the case study school, budget planning is a resource driven, managerialist exercise, prioritised within May of the school year to coincide with the completion of the department development plan.

Surprisingly, within the interview data, no significant reference was made by principal teachers to the process on self-evaluation using QI's, despite all principal teachers being required by the head teacher, to submit departmental self-evaluation data in June. This indicates possibly, that the process of self-evaluation is regarded as a "paper exercise", which does not directly influence the management of people, change, or resources, and provides a further example of ritualised compliance with the demands of performativity.

5.8.7 Administration

In September of the academic year, new cohorts of pupils were beginning new courses at all levels. The focus of principal teachers at this time was on administrative tasks, which is illustrated by principal teacher B who states,

"Priorities now are UCAS applications, and the use of monitoring sheets in S1."

From the research data, it would appear that as far as administrative tasks are concerned, there is little difference between the priorities of principal teachers of pastoral care and subjects. However one difference was highlighted by principal teacher A (pastoral care),

"We are drawing up the rota of when pupil review meetings are ... to ensure teachers now know when the review meetings are, and can they be covered? That is something no-one else is focusing on."

Review meetings involve a pupil, their parents, class teacher and principal teacher together with other associated professionals assessing progress with learning, and planning for the future.

Whole school timetabling was also a priority for this principal teacher, who is responsible for the placing of support staff into subject classes, and states,

"My priority now is trying ... because I'm hopefully getting more staff ... to start looking at timetables."

From the research data, the main focus of principal teachers appeared to be on the pursuit of operational rather than strategic management tasks. In terms of performance, this raises the question about obtaining best value for middle managers, when as Torrington and Weightman(1989:92) suggest that administration is,

"Work that can be done by an intelligent sixteen year old."

Within a school, administration represents a mechanism for managing resources in the public sector, where efficiency gains are made at all costs. Perhaps then, there is a tension between administration and performance management, where the former focuses on value for money, and the latter on achieving targets.

5.8.8 Final Summary

The research data indicates that the management time of principal teachers within the case study school is eroded by the processes of career review and class observations, perceived by principal teachers to be performance management practices. Within the management of people, the pursuit of excellence in teacher performance is the main objective of principal teachers, in response to pressures of both accountability and

performance. However, these tasks are carried out by principal teachers in isolation from each other within the school.

It appears that fabricated collegiality exists amongst principal teachers within the case study school, possibly due to the fear of the head teacher that his authority might be decentralised, if staff had a regular opportunity to communicate with one another.

The principal focus of the management of change, is the improvement of learning and teaching reflecting 'authentic practice'. However, this is perceived as being difficult within a hierarchal structure of accountability, as new policies must be successfully implemented at senior management team and principal teacher level before being introduced into classrooms. This can result in a perceived 'dilution' of the ultimate effectiveness of any new policy introduced within the case study school.

Although the issue of leadership was not referred to directly by principal teachers during the interview process, evidence of strategic and responsive leadership was revealed during the analysis of data which reflected the dimensions of 'performance practice'. Structures and processes were interpreted by principal teachers through the process of development planning, in order to exert a positive impact on learning and teaching in order to achieve attainment targets.

The process of career review, although time consuming, was regarded generally as a positive process, as it made teachers feel valued and therefore contributed to the improvement of individual teacher performance. However, career review was perceived by principal teachers primarily to be a performance management tool, where the performance of teachers could be improved by identifying weaknesses in professional practice and implementing appropriate CPD training.

The management of the departmental budget focused on the purchase of resources which would give an instant return in terms of pupil attainment, rather than on meeting the needs of individual pupils to enable effective access to learning, illustrating the focus on 'performance practice' rather than 'authentic practice' amongst principal teachers. Also, the hierarchal structure of accountability within the case study school was found not to facilitate the co-ordination of budgets between departments, resulting in difficulty meeting the organisational objectives of improved performance.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Following the analysis of data, and the discussion of the main themes of accountability, management and performance arising from the data within the framework of 'authentic', 'performance' and 'integrated' practices, an attempt will now be made in the concluding chapter, to address each of the three research questions in section 6.1. This will be followed by consideration of the effectiveness of market mechanisms within the case study school authority in section 6.2, and a proposal for a new system of accountability in section 6.3. The research method will then be evaluated in section 6.4, and a final conclusion presented in section 6.5.

6.1 Research Questions

6.1.1 Research Question 1

"What are the perceptions of principal teachers of performance management practices at different times within the school academic year?"

The research data indicated that the perceptions of principal teachers of performance management practices such as self-evaluation, development planning and the analysis of STACS data was not consistent throughout the year. Perceptions were different in May and September, possibly due to different performance pressures being exerted upon them at those times.

It also emerged from the research data that there was a clear difference between the perceptions of performance management practices by the principal teachers of pastoral care on the one hand and subject disciplines on the other.

In May, the focus of principal teachers was primarily on self-evaluation using quality indicators, and the production of a departmental development plan reflecting 'performance practice'. It emerged from the data however, that self-evaluation procedures were not carried out at any other time within the school year, reflecting perhaps ritualistic compliance with the procedures of performativity by principal teachers.

In May of the school year, principal teachers had recently received a budget allowance for the acquisition of resources. The research data revealed that the departmental need for resources were assessed by principal teachers intuitively, reflecting perhaps 'authentic practice', rather than through the application of a performance procedure. Departmental resource needs were the main influence on development planning, rather than that of the school development plan, or the outcomes of STACS data analysis.

It was in September that principal teachers were required to analyse their departmental performances using STACS data. Their perception of the function of this 'performance practice', according to the data, was to monitor the individual performance of class teachers within the departments, thereby holding them accountable to their principal teacher.

The differences in the perception of performance management practices between the principal teachers of pastoral care and subjects it emerged, were mainly due to accountability and leadership issues according to the research data. It is

acknowledged however, that differences in the perception of performance management practices could also be influenced by the specific roles and duties of principal teachers of subjects and pastoral care.

The principal teachers of pastoral care stated that they were accountable in the first instance to pupils, parents and outside agencies reflecting 'authentic practice'. The principal teachers of subjects however, felt that they were accountable first to their line manager within the hierarchal model of management, reflecting 'performance practice'.

It emerged from the research data that principal teachers of subjects exhibited 'strategic leadership' by interpreting performance management practices in order to improve learning and teaching within their departments. This perhaps signalled an attempt by principal teachers to conserve 'authentic' practice within a climate of performativity, where they rejected the administrative procedures of performance management for authentic practice, which they felt had a more positive impact on learning and teaching. However, this may also be interpreted as principal teachers improving learning and teaching through performance management in order to achieve improvement in pupil attainment in examinations, exhibiting 'performance practice.'

Principal teachers of pastoral care however, the data suggested, exhibited 'responsive leadership' by responding directly to the expectations of both pupils and parents, providing evidence of 'authentic' practice. This is in contrast to the principal teachers of subjects, who respond first to their line manager fulfilling the demands of performance, rather than to parents for provision of learning and teaching.

The results of the research indicated that performance management practices within May and September of the school year varied, and were perceived differently by principal teachers of pastoral care and subjects. This raises the question about the consistency of performance management procedures within the case study school, and indeed their effectiveness in bringing about improvements in learning and teaching.

As mentioned previously in chapter 1, market and managerial reform is concerned with increasing efficiency and raising standards in schools. Accountability is central to this new managerialist approach. Subject principal teachers within the case study school seem to have been to some extent, reconstructed as managers of reform. Compared to their pastoral care colleagues, the research evidence suggests that subject principal teachers are making more of an attempt to implement performance management procedures through self-evaluation. This is perhaps due in part to subject principal teachers being held to account for their pupils performance in external examinations, which will be discussed in the following section 6.2.

6.1.2 Research Question 2

"How does performance management impact on the professional practice of principal teachers within learning and teaching, together with the management of a department?"

The performance management practices of self-evaluation, development planning, and the outcomes of STACS data were mechanisms to hold principal teachers to account within the case study school, through a hierarchal structure of management. It emerged from the research data that this mechanism of accountability impacted of the professional practice of principal teachers.

The research data suggested that principal teachers of subjects exhibited 'performance practice' by perceiving accountability for their personal performance through self-evaluation and STACS analysis, as being primarily to their line manager within the hierarchal structure. Research data from the interview with the head teacher confirmed this, as his main concern was the performance of principal teachers within the case study school. It may be speculated that there was a 'fear' amongst principal teachers of poor performance, which would affect the status of individuals within the school, and their standing within the community. The majority of teachers within the school hold positions within the small local community, such as membership of the Community Council, the Church and other organisations. Here teachers meet socially with parents, and may be informally questioned regarding school issues. Within these arenas, the status of teachers within the community is very important.

The research data supported the notion that principal teachers of subjects were adopting those learning and teaching approaches that would result in higher QI ratings, and improve examination results, (performance practice) rather than focusing on the needs of individual pupils (authentic practice).

It may be argued that improving a child's examination performance does not necessarily mean that their needs have been met. It is important to take into account all aspects of the development of young people including psychological, physiological and cultural needs. Possessing a higher grade in an examination does not guarantee their ability to meet and address problems, influencing their subsequent effectiveness in the workplace, and in their personal lives. Referring to the myth of the "lad o'pairts", it is difficult to sustain the myth of equal opportunity for all young people, when only those pupils who are likely to achieve in terms of examination results command the attention of teachers.

According to the research data, this situation is reversed for the principal teachers of pastoral care. Here accountability was towards pupils and parents, with the main focus being on the personal achievements of individuals, rather than on examination results. Principal teachers of pastoral care, the evidence suggests, exhibited 'authentic' rather than 'performance' practices, and were able to effectively separate the two within their personal teaching practice. Although compliant with performance practices it may be speculated, they chose to adopt authentic professional practice. It could also be speculated that within the case study school, principal teachers of subjects are defining their professional practice through the ability to follow performance management procedures, rather than be the effective facilitators of the learning process. The former may be described as the completion of documentation, such as self-evaluation grids, by a specific deadline, 'performance practice'. The latter focuses on the interaction between teacher and pupil to maximise the learning experience of both, 'authentic practice'.

Performance management procedures hold principal teachers to account through a system of bureaucratic accountability within the case study school, thereby reducing autonomy. As a result, principal teachers have become increasingly withdrawn into their departments in order to preserve autonomy, and are effectively teaching within a 'silo'. This was supported by evidence from the research data which found that none of the principal teachers had viewed or discussed the development plan of another department, despite these being readily available on the school network. Also, the school development plan had little influence on departmental development planning, indicating again an attempt by principal teachers to preserve autonomy.

The performance management practice that had the greatest impact on the management of departments, the data suggested, was the career review of staff. This

mechanism of appraisal involved principal teachers conducting individual interviews with staff, where the strengths and weaknesses of their personal professional practice were discussed. Targets were set, and appropriate CPD opportunities made available. The approach of principal teacher to the process of career review was primarily from a 'performance', rather than 'authentic' perspective.

Evidence from the research data suggested that this was a more effective way of assessing the individual performance of teachers, rather than the use of the self-evaluation process. It is speculated that this might have been due to the fact that the career review process took into account emotional, psychological and physiological factors associated with the practice of teaching through one to one discussions, providing richer information. Perhaps, it is more difficult for individuals to exhibit fabricated compliance in a face to face interview, than through the completion of self evaluation documentation. Also, self-evaluation procedures using QI's when applied to the assessment of individual performance are unable to produce a reliable measure due to the lack of baseline measurement.

It also emerged from the research data that performance management practices resulted in principal teachers within the case study school, focusing on the use of resources within departments, rather than the development of learning and teaching. Resources were being prioritised according to those that would impact on external examination outcomes, rather than those that would address the needs of individual pupils. For example, the purchase of "Success Guides" and past exam papers which were useful to academic pupils, but did not address the needs of those who learned through practical experiences. This provided evidence again for 'authentic practice' being sacrificed for 'performance practice'.

The introduction of Curriculum for Excellence into Scottish schools from August 2010, may influence this current state of affairs however. The focus is on pupil outcomes rather than on attainment in examinations, within the framework of the four capacities; successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors. By implementing a lighter, less prescriptive curriculum, teachers will have greater autonomy and choice. A creative teaching approach is encouraged, which however is inhibited by the use of performance indicators. The education professional's cognition ends up artificially obsessed with defined performance indicators, which inhibits reflective design, practice and creativity (Meng, 2009).

Curriculum for Excellence signals a change in the professional practice of teachers from performance managers to authentic practitioners. With greater emphasis on formative rather than summative assessment practices, it is likely that new methods of teacher accountability will evolve as performance goals change.

As the new curriculum is introduced, it would seem that tensions will arise between current performance management practices, and the aims of Curriculum for Excellence. According to Building the Curriculum 5 (HMIE, 2009), Curriculum for Excellence will focus more on qualitative measures of pupil success, rather than quantitative measures of attainment, and associated teacher accountability. A new system of accountability which articulates with the aims of Curriculum for Excellence will, in my opinion, have to be developed which will incorporate criteria based on authentic practice.

6.1.3 Research Question 3

"What impact does development planning as a tool of performance management have on the professional practice of principal teachers?"

According to Shore and Wright (2000:58), the purpose of performance management procedures, such as the construction of a development plan,

"Rests upon the simultaneous imposition of external control from above (through the school development plan), and the internalisation of new norms, so that individuals can continuously improve themselves."

Currently, within Scottish education, the political control of teachers is pursued through the statement of national priorities within the school development plan, which must in turn appear in the development plan of each department, with an indication of how these will be implemented.

However, it emerged from the research data that the departmental development plans of the principal teachers interviewed, were not significantly influenced by either the school development plan, or the analysis of STACS data. The primary influence on development planning was individual department needs, particularly resources. This reinforces the view discussed previously, that principal teachers within the case study school were teaching in 'silos', resisting influences of the school as an organisation.

Thirty years ago, according to the minutes of principal teacher and senior management team meetings, this was not the situation within the school. Departments worked closely together using a thematic approach, which at the time was facilitated by the school timetable. This allowed departments to exchange staff, and work together for blocks of time within the school week. Teaching staff moved between departments, offering expertise in at least two subject areas. Weekly meetings took

place between principal teachers and senior managers regarding learning and teaching within the school. However, the impact of performativity within the school means that these practices no longer exist.

The research evidence suggests that principal teachers pursued 'fabricated compliance' when constructing the development plan, prioritising department needs first, then fitting around these the requirements of the school development plan, in order to claim successful completion of the process. It may be speculated that this focus of departmental needs in the form of resources by principal teachers, could have been driven by the need to be accountable for improvement in examination results, and so be viewed as 'successful' within the local community, as discussed previously.

Development planning within the case study school would appear to be driven by a 'fear' of accountability, rather than by the learning needs of pupils. This was supported by evidence from the research data, where principal teachers had difficulty in providing examples of improved classroom teaching as a direct result of development planning, in both May and September of the school year.

This again reflects the adoption by principal teachers of 'performance practice' as opposed to 'authentic' practice within the case study school.

Evidence from the research data suggested that the principal teachers interviewed, welcomed the idea of discussing their development plans with colleagues, if time was made available to them to facilitate engagement in collegiate, professional discussion. This in turn would help to strengthen links between department development plans and the school development plan. However, there was no reference to provision of this opportunity for principal teachers within either the head teacher interview, or senior management team minutes for 2007-08. It is speculated that this might be

perhaps because the head teacher feels that collegiality between departments could decentralise his personal authority within the school (Southworth, 1985).

6.2 Towards a New System of Accountability

Performance management systems of accountability such as development planning, self-evaluation, peer review and inspection, are highly routinised and perhaps may be associated with enhanced powers of the Scottish Government to exert teacher control and surveillance. This perhaps, is to ensure increased compliance and productivity of teachers, in response to targets set by the Scottish Government.

Smyth and Shacklock (1998) highlight the tension between the need for a more skilled effective workforce, and teachers who remain unconvinced about the linear conception of performativity involved in meeting disembodied and often unrealistic targets.

Ball (2001) observes that this tension is revealed in the form of a "dual identity", where measures of performance have become separated from the lived reality and experience in which learning and teaching takes place. This observation by Ball was evident within the research data, which revealed a creative, routinised compliance amongst principal teachers of subjects in particular, reflected in 'performance practices'.

Within a new system of accountability, perhaps there should be less emphasis on the performance of individual teachers, and more emphasis on the use of evaluation procedures for the development of learning and teaching. This approach would require the Scottish Government perhaps, to invest a greater level of trust in the

professionalism of teachers. This is essential to the successful implementation of Curriculum for Excellence, where teachers will have greater autonomy within an outcome based curriculum.

The opportunity to introduce a new system of accountability within Scottish schools now exists perhaps, with the Concordat agreed between COSLA and the Scottish Government at the end of 2007. The Concordat is about accounting for the achievement of public services locally, and how they contribute towards the Government's national outcomes, together with local priorities. Through the Concordat, the Scottish Government is now concentrating on *what* has to be achieved, rather than *how* it has to be achieved. This shift in focus could provide an opportunity for less reliance in schools on routinised accountability procedures, and greater emphasis on professional development.

Gleeson and Husbands (2003) propose two opposing models of accountability in schools. The first is the 'managed school', which is directed by the Government and where efficiently obtained, pre-defined outcomes are sought from pupils, teachers and head teacher. The focus of accountability here is on the performance of teachers. The second model is the 'renewed school' which is open, collaborative and self-critical. Professional cultures focus on learning and teaching, professional development of teachers and educational values. This reflects a model of authentic accountability.

The research evidence suggested that the case study school bore most resemblance to the 'managed school' model. The challenge in the future must be to find a balance between these two models of accountability, and provide a more equitable education for all pupils. To be able to accomplish this would mean giving greater democratic voice to both teachers and the community (Whitty, 2000). The role of HMIE would perhaps also have to be changed to one in which there was less emphasis on meeting

specified targets and completing performance procedures. Instead, the new role of HMIE within a more authentic system of accountability would involve the support of teachers, and moderation of professional accountability outcomes in order to achieve the national outcomes for education stated within the Concordat.

With the permission of the head teacher of the case study school, it is my intention to introduce an authentic system of teacher accountability within my department, which consists of eleven teachers. This new framework of accountability would include the following stages,

1. Discussion and agreement of educational values.
2. Audit of learning and teaching regarding achievement of educational values.
3. Appropriate CPD and personal support to facilitate change and development.
4. Regular opportunity for professional discussion.
5. Evaluation of learning and teaching by pupils and parents.
6. Action on pupil / parent perspectives.
7. Encouragement of teacher leadership.

This might lead to some deconstruction of the formal accountability hierarchy, which would be replaced instead by distributed leadership, involving all teachers in decision making within the department. The advantage of this would be hopefully, a decrease in individual pressures due to a more even distribution of responsibilities. Also, the unique personal professional strengths of all teachers would hopefully be more effectively utilised, both empowering and motivating all individuals. This distribution of leadership could potentially play a critical role on the development of a societal,

democratic citizenship, because by empowering teachers, they are encouraged to develop a more constructive critical voice, providing sound role models for our young citizens of the future (Bottery, 2004).

According to Oduro (2004), leadership is the main driver to school effectiveness and improvement. However, there is some confusion in distinguishing distributed leadership from related terms such as 'distributive', 'dispersed', 'shared', 'democratic' and 'collaborative' leadership. Each of these may be defined in a different way within the literature. This research adopts the definition presented by the Chicago Centre for School Improvement, which states that

"Distributed leadership takes place when people who have been appointed officially as head teachers become committed to building a learning organisation, providing opportunities for all to give their gifts, develop their skills and have access to leadership that is not dependant on one's place in the hierarchy or formal organisational chart."

The effectiveness of the principal of distributed leadership in practice however, is dependant upon the ability of teachers to assume leadership roles within the constraints of their remits, trust, sharing a common vision and financial capacity (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992).

Within such a new system of accountability, there would be more emphasis on a democratic approach through the current hierarchal system. For example, quality indicators for the department could perhaps be constructed as a result of professional discussion between colleagues, rather than being imposed by the Scottish Government. These in turn could be influenced by local pupil and parent needs. Accountability for learning and teaching would then be firmly placed within the local

context, leading perhaps to greater improvement in external examinations, and provision of a high quality learning experience for all pupils.

6.4 Evaluation of the Research Method

This research was a naturalistic study, which was intended to give a unique insight into the perceptions of principal teachers regarding performance management practices in May and September of the year 2007. It would be difficult to replicate this research exactly in the future, as is the case with quantitative research. However, there are a number of constant perspectives that could be replicated in a similar case study. These might include the status and position of the researcher, choice of respondents, social situation, analytic constructs, and methods of data collection and analysis (Le Compte and Preissle 1993). Each of these perspectives will now be considered.

My position as a principal teacher within the case study school conferred upon me a similar status to the participants which was an advantage as I was known and trusted. This helped participants to feel at ease during the interviews, and able to speak freely. For myself as the researcher, it was difficult to maintain absolute neutrality in thoughts and unspoken opinions at all times. On balance, I believe this was a more effective approach than entering another school as an external researcher, where facing an unknown person, participants may have been guarded, suspicious and reluctant to share their feelings.

The participant group of five principal teachers were selected in order to represent as balanced a range as possible of years of service, responsibilities and gender. It is recognised that selection bias may have occurred here, and on reflection perhaps the

participant sample should have been selected randomly by a third party out with the research project.

The size of the participant sample could perhaps have been larger, including a large significant number of principal teachers over a large number of schools. However, although this may have increased the statistical accuracy of the findings, it is unlikely that it would have produced the same depth and richness of information generated by the research.

All interviews were held within the case study school, providing a familiar environment to the principal teachers and head teacher and so hopefully reducing anxiety. However, a disadvantage of this location may have been that principal teachers were fearful of being overheard, or interrupted when making comments on potentially contentious issues within the school. On reflection, holding principal teacher interviews in a location out with the school may have been more effective in reducing this particular anxiety.

Data from each interview was gathered using a WS-100 Olympus digital voice recorder. New batteries were used and the voice recorder tested prior to each interview. However, a technical problem at the beginning of one interview resulted in a delay, increasing the anxiety of the participant. This situation could perhaps have been avoided by using two digital voice recorders at once; in order to have a back up machine, and ensure all interview data had been captured successfully. On reflection, the used of a video recorder would have ensured the collection of both audio and visual data, allowing perhaps a more detailed analysis of the ethnographic elements of the interview process. However, the digital voice recorder was less obtrusive, and therefore less threatening to participants who had expressed reluctance to being filmed during the pilot study.

All interview data was transcribed by the author using Olympus AS-2300 software, with the analysis of the subsequent data generated being carried out manually. Typing of the transcripts provided a valuable opportunity to undertake an initial analysis of the data, and consider emerging themes. Although this process was slow and time consuming, the benefits were that the analysis of was detailed, maintained consistency of meaning and revealed errors through continual 'sweeping' of data.

The dependability of research outcomes might have been improved if each participant had been provided with a complete copy of the transcript of their interview, rather than a brief summary of the findings in May, which all participants were in agreement with. Although providing participants with copies of their interview transcripts would seem to be the perceived basis of respondent validation, Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) advise caution here when they suggest,

"They (participants) are not in a privileged position to be the sole commentators on their actions."

The overall validity of the data could perhaps have been enhanced by interviewing participants additionally in January and November of the school year, 2007. However, faced with being interviewed four times as opposed to twice, it is likely that a number of principal teachers would have dropped out of the research. As the research method stood, no participants withdrew from the study.

Secondary data was derived from the analysis of the senior management team minutes from May 2007 until May 2008. Analysis of the minutes prior to 2007 would have provided a greater depth of information. The self-evaluation returns of principal teachers were examined, and notes made of the main patterns of data observed. This

might have given more insight into the research if a complete statistical analysis of the self-evaluation data had been carried out.

The overall validity of data analysis within this research could perhaps have been enhanced by inviting a second researcher to examine the interview data and comment on the process of analysis, together with outcomes. However, undertaking the research within an isolated community made this difficult to arrange, and I was aware of the commitment of time which would be required if a colleague within the school was approached.

Another procedure to enhance the validity of data which might have been more easily arranged would have been the gathering of principal teachers interviewed into a "focus group", where the outcomes of both the May and September interviews could have formed the focus of professional debate. This might also have given myself as the researcher, an opportunity to seek clarification on issues arising from the interview data. However, this might have raised the ethical issue of confidentiality, as the principal teachers who were interviewed, together with the head teacher, were not aware of the identity of the other participants who took part in the research.

6.5 Final Conclusion

From the research data, it was possible to identify 'authentic', 'performance' and 'integrated' practices, within the daily work of principal teachers within the case study school. The perceptions of performance management practices by principal teachers in May and September of the school year 2007 varied, according to the performance pressures upon them at those times of the year. However, throughout the school year, the emphasis of subject principal teachers was primarily on 'performance

practices.' A significant difference was found between the perception of principal teachers of pastoral care and the principal teachers of subjects, regarding performance management practices. Subject principal teachers followed the demands of performativity through performance practices such as self-evaluation, development planning. Pastoral care teachers however, focused on the needs of individual pupils through authentic practices, such as planning learning and teaching according to individual pupil requirements, rather than simply to achieve attainment targets. Integrated practices, which could be interpreted as 'authentic' or 'performance' practices, such as pupil self-evaluation, occurred primarily amongst subject principal teachers.

Principal teachers were found to be compliant with the process of development planning, although no evidence was found for its connection with self-evaluation and other quality assurance procedures. The perceptions of three out of five principal teachers of self-evaluation procedures and the analysis of STACS data, was that these were simply mechanisms used to hold them to account through a hierarchal structure.

Market mechanisms within Scottish education were found not to apply significantly to the case study school, reducing perhaps the need for a formal model of accountability. The time is right perhaps, to consider the effects of market mechanisms in Scottish schools, and construct a new system of accountability which emphasises 'authentic practice' rather than 'integrated' or 'performance' practice, articulating perhaps more clearly with the aims of the four capacities within Curriculum for Excellence.

Finally, this research was able to provide additional evidence, through the case study approach, for

"The disjunction between policy and preferred practice"

as initially identified by McNess, Broadfoot and Osborne (2003:243).

Within the case study school, principal teachers of subjects did not focus on the 'authentic practices' associated with meeting the needs of individual pupils, but were compelled through the pressures of performativity, to focus instead on 'performance practices' exemplified by development planning, self-evaluation, career review and STACS analysis procedures. However, despite this focus on performance practices, which are intended to improve pupils attainment, the performance of pupils within external examinations continues to fall.

Clearly, the mechanisms of performance are *not* having a positive impact on pupil attainment. It may be speculated that within the case study school, principal teachers are 'going through the motions' of performance practices such as development planning, and self-evaluation. Perhaps because the use of How Good is Our School for example, has been imposed upon them without consultation. Principal teacher D referred to development planning as,

"... just a paper exercise."

The outcome of this could be, that less time is being spent on learning and teaching, resulting in poor pupil performance overall. Teachers planning underpins the success of curriculum delivery. If teachers are under increasing pressure to undertake performance practices as part of their working day, then perhaps essential planning time is being sacrificed to the detriment of pupil learning.

The research data revealed that there was evidence of a disjunction between the views of principal teachers of pastoral care and those of subjects, regarding performativity. Principal teachers of pastoral care exhibited 'authentic' practices, whereas principal teachers of subjects exhibited 'performance' and 'integrated' practices. This

divergence of views within the school as an organisation, indicates perhaps the movement of both groups towards *different* goals, which may have a negative impact on pupil achievement. It suggests perhaps that subject principal teachers are prioritising the goals of the procedural aspects of performativity, rather than the learning needs of pupils, prioritised by principal teachers of pastoral care.

Within the case study school at present, in order to reduce the number of principal teachers of pastoral care, five 0.5 FTE posts are being combined into four 1.0 FTE posts. As a result, the remits of the new full time principal teachers of pastoral care have a new focus, which according to a member of the senior management team when addressing a staff meeting, will focus on 'performance' rather than 'authentic' practice,

"The senior management team is now placing an emphasis within pastoral care, on improvement in attainment. We are now recording MiDYiS scores, target grades and prelim grades. Pastoral care teachers are in the ideal situation to monitor and track achievement using this data and the knowledge of the pupil. It is the pastoral care teachers who are in the position to notice anomalies in performance across subjects, and see opportunities to increase the number of credit grades and higher passes."

This is an interesting turn of events. Principal teachers of pastoral care and subjects may now converge towards the same goals of performance, however this could be at the expense of 'authentic' practice, and have a negative impact on pupil learning. Performativity appears to have increasing priority within the case study school, even although the effects of market mechanisms within the education authority are negligible.

As a researcher, and principal teacher within the case study school, I set out to find the 'meaning' of performativity, and how it affected the professional practice of principal teachers. The research data allowed me to gain knowledge and understanding of this aspect of performativity within a local context, which I hope may contribute to the current discourse surrounding education improvement.

There is no doubt, in my opinion, that the implementation of Curriculum for Excellence in 2010, will impact upon the current mechanisms of accountability in Scottish schools, and subsequently how performativity affects professional practice of teachers in the future.

Appendix 1

Letters to Participants

" An Exploration into the Effects of Performance and Organisational Management on the Professional Practice of Principal Teachers within a Scottish Secondary School."

1st May, 2007.

Dear

Within my Ed.D course at Edinburgh University, I have now reached the final Thesis stage, which will focus on the effects of Quality Assurance procedures and Organisational Management on the professional practice of Principal Teachers and Senior Managers within the school, through a Case Study approach.

I would be most grateful if you were able to accept this invitation to take part in the research.

Participation will take the form of an individual, thirty minute taped interview, which will be strictly confidential. All interviews will be deleted at the end of the research.

A summary of findings will be made available to you on completion of the research.

Interviews will be held in Room 101 during the week beginning 14th may, 2007. Please indicate a day and time within that week which would be suitable for you to attend, by completing the slip below, and returning it to me by **Friday 11th May, 2007.**

Your contribution to this research is extremely valuable, and very much appreciated.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Angela Drummond.

I, (name)_____ accept the invitation to contribute

to this research, and will be available for interview on:

Day / Date:

" An Exploration into the Effect of Performance and Organisational Management, on the Professional practice of Principal Teachers within a Scottish Secondary School."

18th September, 2007.

Dear

Thank you very much for taking part in the first round of my research, it was extremely valuable and much appreciated. I have enclosed a paper comparing the data collected on the main themes of "Assessment" and "Accountability" with the literature. I wish to extend a second invitation to you to take part in a follow up interview, which will comprise of similar questions to the first round, together with an opportunity to comment on the paper.

As before, interviews will be anonymous and confidential. They will last twenty five minutes, and be held in Room 101 in the week beginning **24th September, 2007.**

I would be grateful if you could let me know of a convenient time for you during that week, which may be during non-contact time, lunchtime, or after school.

Following the second round of interviews, the research will be complete and a summary of the findings will be made available to you.

Yours sincerely,

Angela Drummond.

Appendix 2

Coding Frame – Principal Teachers

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
	Code	Meaning of Code		Code	Meaning of Code		Code	Meaning of Code
	AT	Addressing attainment of year group cohorts		NC	Addressing needs / concerns of individuals		LT	Changing L/T according to context
	QI	Selecting learning / teaching methods resulting in high QI rating		CP*	Curriculum does not meet pupil needs		MDU	Individual pupil data useful
	CR	Teaching curriculum to satisfy self evaluation requirements		C	Teaching only relevant parts of curriculum		ACL*	Accountability to colleagues
	PM	Completion of DDP, S&Q report, provision of evidence		TLT	Majority of time spent on learning/teaching		AA*	Accountability erodes autonomy
	PA	Focus on priority areas in HGIOS / SDP		PPP	Focus on personal professional priorities		AD	Accountability to other departments
	EX	Teaching to improve exam results		NNC*	Needs of individuals not addressed		QM	Quality assurance has little meaning
	AN	Self evaluation documents completed once per year		SE	Self evaluation not continuous throughout year		PT*	Performance of teachers
	MPP	Management priorities, attainment results, career reviews, provision CPD, DDP, use of QI's		MP	Management priorities, managing people, change, curriculum, L/T, resources, budget		ID*	Use of internal assessment data
	Ac*	Accountability for practice		A*	Outside agencies			
	H*	Hierarchal model HT/DH/PT		P*	Accountable to parents			
	G*	Government initiative		h*	Accountable to pupils, parents, myself			
	S*	Difficulty of STACS format		ED*	Limited use of external data			

	Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
	Code	Meaning of Code		Code	Meaning of Code		Code	Meaning of Code	
	ODS2*	Do not exam STACS data of other departments		D*	Discipline issues				
	ODS1*	Examine STACS data of other departments		IP*	Individual pupil progress				
	QD*	Quality assurance dependant on other teachers / departments		NIP*	Individual pupil progress limited				
	QC*	Quality assurance procedures ongoing		TS	Teaching priority to develop thinking / personal skills of pupils				
	LM*	STACS data interpreted for PT by line manager							
	IQI*	QI's not useful in development planning							
	CDP*	Development plan format							
	SDP*	STACS data does not inform DDP							
	DP*	Development plan of limited use							
	VDP*	Development plan very useful							
	NSD*	Development plan not influenced by the SDP							
	SD*	Development plan is influenced by the SDP							
	EV*	Use of internal / external assessment data							
	SI*	Improvement in pupil attainment as result of STACS analysis							
	NSI*	No improvement in pupil attainment as result of STACS							

	Performance Practice			Authentic Practice			Integrated Practice		
	Code	Meaning of Code		Code	Meaning of Code		Code	Meaning of Code
	VSD1*	STACS data not valid							
	VSD2*	STACS data valid							
	MDV*	Question validity of STACS data							
	MDU*	Individual pupil data useful							
	SDV*	Current year's STACS data useful							
	SD NV*	Current year's STACS data not useful							

Appendix 3

Coding Frame – Head Teacher

Performance Practice			Authentic Practice		
	Code	Meaning of Code		Code	Meaning of Code
	SEY	Self evaluation / SDP referred to all year		AP	Addressing individual staff, parent, pupil issues
	DPT	PT career reviews / CPD / DDP / SQ report discussions		DLT	Development of L/T throughout school
	SDP	Production / review of SDP		RDC	Review / development of curriculum
	QIO	Meetings with quality improvement officer		CP*	Consistent practice
	HA*	Hierarchal accountability		AL*	Importance of Assessment is for Learning
	CM*	Change management		OT*	Focus on outcomes
	EP*	Evaluation procedures		PR*	Professional reflection
	PPT*	Performance management of PT's		AU*	Autonomy of school / departments / PTs
	HGU*	HGIOS useful		CA*	Collegiate approach
	HGN*	HGIOS not useful			
	QA*	Quality assurance, purpose and role			
	SA*	Systematic approach to QA important			
	EXC*	Pursuit of excellence			
	OM*	Organisational management			
	NLP*	National / local priorities			
	SUM*	Use of STACS / MidYis data			

Appendix 4

"How Good is Our School 3" (HMIE) Quality Indicators

The framework of quality indicators are arranged under six key questions,

1. What outcomes have we achieved?
2. How well do we meet the needs of our school community?
3. How good is the education we provide?
4. How good is our management?
5. How good is our leadership?
6. What is our capacity for improvement?

The quality of what is observed within each quality indicator can be judged against six levels.

Level 6 – excellent – pupil's experiences and achievements of a very high quality. Outstanding standard of provision, exemplifying best practice.

Level 5 – very good – provision characterized by major strengths. Few areas for improvement. Continue to make provision without significant adjustment.

Level 4 – good – strengths of provision outweigh areas for improvement and have significant impact. Pupil's experience diminished in areas where improvement is required.

Level 3 – adequate – strengths of provision just outweigh weaknesses. Basic level of provision for pupils. Weaknesses constrain overall quality of pupil experiences.

Level 2 – weak – some strengths but significant weaknesses. Substantial negative effect on pupil experiences. Need for prompt, structure, planned action.

Level 1 – unsatisfactory – major weaknesses requiring remedial action. Staff responsible for provision evaluated as unsatisfactory will require support to effect improvement.

(HMIE, 2007)

Appendix 5

Sample Interview Transcript

Transcript 008

Principal Teacher May Group

Participant 2

" Getting ready to test the S3 for the end of year exam. This is really important for them because it's their first real experience of exam technique. Making sure that everyone is comfortable with the process and making sure that the tests we are setting are up to date.

Looking forward to the next couple of weeks, I know we have the start of the new term coming up, what will your priorities be perhaps in the next week or two?

" It will be planning once I get the exams over. It's doing a major departmental plan."

Does that tie in with self-evaluation procedures?

"Yes, take the QI's as a starting point and I use it at Departmental meetings and I phase it rather than try to get through it all in one. So next week and the week after we will look at the QI's and that's the starting point for evaluating how we've done and what I have to continue to feed into the next plan as the new aspects, it's a two level process."

So, the priorities that you have this year, would you say they are fairly typical of this time of year?

"Yes I would, its pretty much a pattern, and I have a staff review to do as well next week, so I tend to utilise study leave to plan, evaluate what we have done over the past year and then forward plan for next year."

So do most self-evaluation procedures then take place during study leave because there's more time to do these things?

"Yes, I find there is very little time for reflection because of the pace we are working at now throughout the year."

So this is a good time of year to look at that?

'Yes because staff have the space to be more reflective and I have the time to do the actual planning."

It's a good point, certainly. The term Quality Assurance is frequently used in education, we hear this term everywhere, what does it mean to you as far as the school is concerned, what do you see as being the main meaning or purpose of QA?

" It's a very very wide question!"

It is a wide question, when I ask that question, what's the first thing that comes into your mind when you are thinking about QA?

"There are two angles to it as far as I am concerned as a PT, there seems to be far more QA nowadays and that's bound up with the need to be accountable. With all the…..i think it comes from the Scottish Executive down and I am drawing also now on my previous experience as a development officer for the Authority and there is this huge need for accountability, which I think I have various feelings about. We can look at from the practical angle of the need to prove that we re performing well, and the drive to improve performance to benefit children that's understandable. I am a little bit uncomfortable with the fact that there is this element of well because we have to meet all those targets are we being trusted fully professionally? That is a personal angle."

These processes have an impact on professionalism?

"Yes, very much."

And so do you feel that the professionalism of teachers then is changing as a result of QA procedures, do you feel what we might have described as being our professional competencies ten years ago, are now changing?

" Yes, we have life long learning angle and the need to keep abreast as education is in a constant state of flux and evolving and all our subjects are progressing. There is this professional need to keep up to date. Yes, I think teachers always have been very professional, but I'm slightly uncomfortable with this constant accountability and checking on whether we have done this or that."

So who do you think we are accountable to ultimately?

"Ultimately it's SEED, HMIE, yes."

So from a school based level, who do you think we are accountable to?

"The Education Department, more than our Head Teacher or line managers, I think the drive comes from there, from the EA."

If we think about QA and the self evaluation that you are going to be involved in during the next couple of weeks, and you were saying that it is typical you will have done the same exercise last year, can you give any example of self evaluation procedure which then had a direct effect on learning and teaching within your Department, from last year's exercise?

" Yes I think so. We are scrutinising our S£ pupils more closely because we take all comers in my subject we ….pause…..they are an unknown quantity its an open option choice therefore we are dealing with all comers and teaching at multiple levels within each of our six classes in S3, so we have looked at how we can support the S3 in different ways and improve their performance. Also we are now coming round to the idea that perhaps we shouldn't be taking all comers because a very small portion of our pupils perhaps shouldn't have been there in the first place. So we are looking at

being more selective but at the same time we have looked very closely and this has been ongoing all year, at using a bit of AifL and the support for pupils department, to enable those pupils to get the best out of the subject."

Thank you, can you - we were talking about professionalism earlier, can you think of a way perhaps that QA has changed your own teaching practice, within the classroom. Has it impacted on that at all?

"Maybe not hugely, because over the years as a practiced teacher, I use what I find works, and yes a lot of those AifL techniques are great but I've been using them to a greater and lesser extent over the years anyhow, so it's reinventing the wheel, so maybe not a huge impact but at the same time I may be more results driven now……as a result of increased pressure, QA and the process and the accountability."

What would you say is the main purpose then of the DDP do you think, as you have already alluded to, part of the accountability system to the EA and ultimately to SEED or does it have another purpose in your view.

"It has the purpose you've mentioned but to me a greater driving force is that we keep abreast with the subject that we are offering subjects that will be of practical use to our students in every day life and their career choices, I think that is the main thrust of the three subjects we offer and how we adjust those subjects to the upcoming clientele."

The main purpose then is being to provide an appropriate curriculum?

"Absolutely (emphasis), yes that is much more important to me than QA. For example we have offered access when there was need for it, but there doesn't seem to be that same need so we look at what else we can offer."

So it's more reviewing the curriculum?

"Reviewing the curriculum constantly."

How does that tie in with the SDP?

" Yes, at the next Departmental meeting I will take that as well as the QI's and the self evaluation. The next point is to have a look at the list and ticking of what we think applied to us (from the SDP) and take those strands forward and the next stage will be to say well how does this apply to that course and where can we write it in to that course?"

It sounds as if you actively involve all of your staff in self evaluation?

"Very much so, it is more on a weekly basis almost every Dm I will have a heading learning and Teaching."

And so you are constantly reviewing and reflecting?

"Yes, this year it has been the S3 element."

When you are looking at development planning, how useful is STACS data to you in perhaps monitoring pupil achievement or planning out where you are going to go next. Do you use that much?

" I must confess I make very little use of it because it is an absolute minefield of figures and I'm more a visual person than a numerical person."

Do you think the problem is with how the data is presented?

"Yes, it's very complex, I'm quite suspicious of it because is it there to represent a particular angle? Is it there to then analyse what we have achieved, there's bound to be a comparison made with how we are at the start, then it begs the question are we to be measured against that? I'm a little bit wary, of it."

What data perhaps do you use to monitor pupil progress?

" Well they come to us as a blank sheet and we tend to have our own internal evaluation on how they are doing."

So would you use data from summative assessments to evaluate how they are doing?

"Yes, we have a spread sheet of their marks throughout the year, then as we get nearer to exams we tend to evaluate their weak areas and give them encouragement, but its more perhaps verbal encouragement rather than marking and not too many comments. I do more peer group assessment as the time goes on so that they have a rounded angle of how they are doing."

So you use internal data within the department really?

"Yes, that's more valuable to us. How they are progressing within the subject."

Thank you very much for taking part. These are valuable viewpoints.

References

Acker, S. (1999) *The Realities of Teachers' Work: Never a dull moment*, London: Cassell.

Adelman et.al.(1980) *Rethinking Case Study, Notes from the Second Cambridge Conference.* In Simons, H. (Ed) *Towards a Science of the Singular,* University of East Anglia, 45 – 61.

Alderson, P. (2007) *Ethics Review of Social Research*, www.education-line 23.01.07.

Alexander, R.J. (1985) *Primary Education in Leeds*, University of Leeds.

Anderson, R. (1997) *Scottish Education Since the Reformation.* Edinburgh: Economic and Social History Society of Scotland.

Apple, M.W. (1996) *Cultural Politics and Education*, Buckingham: OU Press.

Argyris, C. and Schön, D. (1974) *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Armstrong, M. and Barren, A. (1998) *Performance Management: The New Realities*, London: CIPD.

Ashken, D. and Green, F. (1996) *Education Training and the Global Economy*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Baggot, R. (1998a) The Politics of Health Care Reform in Britain: A moving consensus in Field, D. and Taylor, S. (Eds) *Sociological Perspectives on Health, Illness and Health Care*, Oxford: Blackwell Science.

Ball, S (1990) Management as Moral Technology in Ball, S *Foucault and Education*, London: Routledge.

Ball, S J (1994) *Education Reform: A Critical and Post Structural Approach*, Buckingham: OU Press.

Ball, S. (1990) Management as Moral Technology, in Ball, S. *Foucault and Education*, London: Routledge.

Ball, S. (1999) *Global Trends in Education Reform and the Struggle for the Soul of the Teacher*, Paper presented at BERA conference, University of Sussex, Brighton.

Ball, S. (2001) Performativities and Fragmentation in the Education Economy. Towards the Performative Society in Gleeson, D. and Husbands, C. (Eds) *The Performing School: Managing, Teacher and Learning in a Performance Culture*, London: Routledge.

Ball, S. (2003) *Class Strategies and the Education Market*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Ball, S. (2005) *The Commodification of Education in England: Towards a new forms of Social Relations.*

Ball, S.J (2004) Performativities and Fabrications in the Education Economy: Towards the Performative Society in Ball, S.J. (Ed) *The Routledge Falmer Reader in Sociology of Education*, London: Routledge.

Ball, S.J. (1994) *Education Reform, A Critical and Post-structural Approach*, Buckingham: OU Press.

Ball, S.J. (1999) Labour, learning and the economy. A policy sociology perspective, *The Cambridge Journal of Education*, 29, 2, 195-206.

Barber, B.R. (2002) Jihad USA, McWorld in Ritzer, G. (Ed) *McDonaldisation: the reader*, California: Pine Forge Press.

Barber, M. (2002) *From Good to Great. Large Scale Education Reform in England. Futures of Education*. Arbeit, Bildung und Beruf Conference, Zurich. London: Cabinet Office.

Barber, M., Evans, A. and Johnson, M. (1995) *An Evolution of the National Scheme of School Teacher Appraisal*, London: HMSO.

Barnett, R. (1994) *The Limits and Competence: Knowledge Higher Education and Society*, Buckingham: SRHE and OU Press.

Bassey, M. (1999) *Case Study in Educational Setting,* Buckingham: OU Press.

Bennett, N. (1976) *Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress*, London: Open Books.

Bennett, N., Crawford, M. and Riches, C. (1992) *Managing Change in Education, Individual and Organisational Perspectives*, Milton Keynes: Sage.

Bernstein, B. (1976) On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge in Young, M.F.D. (Ed) *Knowledge and Control*, London: Collier-MacMillan.

Bernstein, B. (1996) *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*, London: Taylor and Francis.

Best, J.W. (1970) *Research in Education,* Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Blumer, H. (1969) *Symbolic Interactionism*, Eaglewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bottery, M. (2004) *The Challenges of Educational Leadership*, London: Paul Chapman Publishing/Sage.

Broadfoot, P. (1999) *Empowerment or Performativity?, English Assessment Policy in the late 20th Century*, BERA Annual Conference.

Brown, A., McCrone, D. and Paterson, L. (1996) *Politics and Society in Scotland,* London and New York: Macmillan Press.

Bryce, T.G.K., and Humes, W.M. (2003) *Scottish Education Post Devolution,* Second Edition, Edinburgh University Press.

Burrell, G. (1998) *Pandemonium : Towards a Retro – Organisation Theory.* London:Sage

Bush, T. (1996) *Theories of Education Management*, London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Bush, T. and Middlewood, D. (1997) *Managing People in Education*, London: Sage.

Bush, T. and West-Burnham, J. (1994) *The Principles of Education Management*, Pearson Education Ltd : Prentice Hall.

Caldwell, B.J. (2002) *A Blueprint for Leadership for the Successful Transformation of Schools in the 21st Century*, Presentation to the National College for School Leadership.

Caldwell, B.J. and Spinks, J.M. (1992) *Leading the Self-managing School*, London: Falmer.

Campbell, R.J. (1985) *Developing the Primary School Curriculum*, London: Holt, Reinhart and Winstein.

Campbell, P. and Southworth, G. (1985) Rethinking Collegiality:Teacher's Views in Bennet et.al. (1992) *Managing Change in Education – Individual and Organisational Perspectives.* London : Sage

Castells, M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Charmaz, K. (1995) Grounded Theory in Smith, J., Horne, R. and Van Lagenhouse, L. (Eds) *Rethinking Methods in Psychology*, London: Sage.

Christie, D. and Kirkwood, M. (2006) *The New Standards Framework for Scottish Teachers: Facilitating or Constraining Reflective Practice*, London : Sage.

Chubb, J. and Moe, T. (1990) *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*, Washington DC: Brookings Institute.

Clark, J. and Newman, J. (1997) *The Managerial State*, London: Sage.

Cohen, D.K. and Ball, D.C. (1999) *Instruction, Capacity and Improvement*, Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) *Research Methods in Education 5th Edition*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Collins, P. (1997) Comment on Hekman's Truth or Method in *Signs*, 22, 2, 392-399.

Cooper, R.K. and Sawaf, A. (1997) *Executive EQ: Emotional Intelligence in Business*, London: Orion.

Coulson, A.A. (1978) Power and Decision Making in the Primary School in Richards, C. (Ed) *Power and the Curriculum. Issues in Curriculum Studies.* Driffield: Nafferton Books.

Coulson, A.A. (1985) *The Managerial Behaviour of Primary School Heads. Collective Original Sources in Education*, Carfax: Abingdon.

Cowie, M. and Croxford, L. (2005) *Measuring and Monitoring School Performance in Scotland.* Education in the North, 12.

Cowie, M., Taylor, D. and Croxford, L. (2006) *Tough, Intelligent Accountability in Scottish Secondary Schools and the Role of STACs: A Critical Appraisal.* CES Briefing 12, University of Edinburgh.

Creemers, B., (2007) *A Comprehensive Framework for Effective School Improvement.* New Perspectives for Learning Briefing Paper 27. Institute for Educational Research. Grinigen, Netherlands.

Currie, D. (1997) *Personnel in Practice*, Oxford: Blackwell Business.

Darling – Hammond, L. (1989) *Accountability for Professional Practice.* Teacher's College Record, 91,1.

Day, C., Kingston, A., Stobart, G. and Sammins, P. (2006) The Personal and Professional Selves of Teachers: Stable and Unstable Identities in *British Educational Research Journal,* 32, 4, August 2006, 601-616.

Denning, W.E. (1982) *Out of the Crisis: Quality Productivity and Competitive Position*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Denzin, N.K. (1994) The Art of Politics of Interpretation in Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.

DfEE (1998a) *Teachers Meeting the Challenge of Change*, London: HMSO.

Docking, J. (2000) (Ed) *New Labour's Policies for Schools: Raising the Standard?* London: David Fulton.

DuGay, P. (1996) *Consumption and Identity at Work*, London: Sage.

Dunning Report, (1977) *Assessment for All,* Edinburgh: SED.

Earl, L. and Katz, S. (2002) Leading Schools in a Data Rich World in Leithwood, K. *et al Second International Handbook of Education Leadership and Administration*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*, London: Falmer Press.

Etzioni, A. (1994) *The Spirit of Community. The Reinvention of American Society*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Eurydice (1992) *The Education Information Network in the European Community, Information Dossiers on the Structures of the Education Systems in the Member States of the European Community*, The Netherlands: Dutch Eurydice Unit.

Everard, B. and Morris G. (1990) *Effective School Management*, London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Everard, K. and Morris G. (1996) *Effective School Management, 3rd Edition*, London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Exworthy, M., Powell, M. and Mohan, J. (1999) The NHS: Quasi-market, Quasi-hierarchy and Quasi-network? In *Public Money and Management*, Oct-Dec 1999.

Ezzy, D. (2002) *Qualitative Analysis: Practice and Innovation*, London: Routledge.

Ferguson, C. (1980) Alternative Organisational Structures in Higher and Further Education in *Coombs Lodge Report*, 12, 12, 535-572.

Fidler, B. (1988) Problems of Adaptation to Education in Fidler, B. and Cooper, R. (Eds) *Staff Appraisal in Schools and Colleges*, Harlow: Longman.

Field, F. (1995) *Making Welfare Work: Reconstructing Welfare for the Millennium*, London: Institute and Community Studies.

Finnigan, K.S. and Gross, B.M. (2001) *Teacher Motivation and the Chicago Probation Policy*, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, Seattle.

Fitz, J. and Beers, A. (2002) Education Management Organisations and the Privatisation of Public Education: A Cross National Comparison of the USA and Britain, *Comparative Education*, 38, 2, 137-154.

Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. (1996) *Monitoring Education: Indicators, Quality and Effectiveness*, London: Cassell.

Flexner, A. (1915) *Is Social Work a Profession?* In proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correctionism, Chicago.

Forrester, V. (1999) *When Quality Assurance hits the rank and file: A critical assessment of Fullan's 'Change Theory'*, paper presented at the British Educational Research Conference, University of Sussex, September 2-5 1999.

Foskett, N.H. (1998) Schools and Marketisation: Cultural changes and responses in *Educational Management and Administration*, 26, 197-210.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Fullan, M. (2001) *Leading in a Culture of Change*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Galton, M. (1980) *Inside the Primary School*, London: Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (2000) *The Third Way and its Critics*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gillies, D.J.M. (2001) *The Scottish Parliament and Education Policy Making.* Unpublished M.Ed. dissertation. University of Strathclyde.

Ginsborg, M.B. (1997) Professionalism or Politics as a Model for Educators Engagements with Communities, *Journal of Education Policy*, 12, 1/2, 5-12.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, Chicago: Aldeine.

Glater, R. (1979) Education Policy and Management: One field or two? *Educational Analysis*, 1, 2.

Gleeson, D. and Husbands, C. (2003) Modernising Schooling Through Performance Management: A Critical Appraisal, *Journal of Education Policy*, 18, 5, 499-511.

Goddard, I. and Emerson, C. (1997) *Appraisal and your School*, Oxford: Heinemann.

Goldsmith, W. and Clutterbuck, D. (1984) *The Winning Streak: Britain's top companies reveal their formula for success*, London: Weiderfeld and Nicolson.

Gray, J. (1998) *False Dawn: The delusions of global capitalism*, London: Granta Books.

Gray, J., Hopkins, D., Reynolds, D., Wilcox, B., Farrell, S. and Jesson, D. (1999) *Improving Schools Performance and Potential*, Buckingham: OU Press.

Gubrum, J. and Holstein, J. (1997) *The New Language of Qualitative Method*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Gunter, H. (2001) *Leaders and Leadership in Education*, London: Paul Chapman.

Hadow Report (1931) *The Primary School*, London: HMSO.

Hammersley, M. (1992) *What is Wrong with Ethnography*, London: Routledge.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1983) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, London: Methuen.

Harding, F. (1987) *Feminism and Methodology*, Milton Keynes: OU Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing Teachers, Changing Times*, London: Cassell.

Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing Teachers, Changing Times. Teachers Work and Culture in the Post Modern Age*, London: Cassell.

Hargreaves, A. (1997) From Reform to Renewal: A new deal for a new age in Hargreaves, A. and Evans, R. (Eds) *Beyond Educational Reform Bringing Teachers Back In*, Buckingham: OU Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2003) *Teaching in the Knowledge Society: Education in the Age of Insecurity*, Maidenhead: OU Press.

Hargreaves, D. (1992) The new professionalism, the synthesis of professional and institutional development. Keynote paper at the fourth international symposium, *Effective Teachers, Effective Schools.* University of New England. NSW Australia. July 1992.

Harling, P. (1984) The Organisational Framework for Educational Leadership in Harling, P. (Ed) *New Directives in Educational Leadership*, Lewes: Falmer Press.

Harris, A. (1997) The Deprofessionalisation and De-skilling of Teachers in Watson, K., Modgil, C. and Modgil, G. (Eds) *Teachers, Teacher Education and Training*, London: Cassell.

Harris,A., and Lambert,L., (2002) *Building Leadership Capacity for School Improvement*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Hartley, D. and Roger, A. (1990) Curriculum and Assessment for Scotland: A Policy for the 90's, in *Bryce, T. and Humes, W. (2003) Scottish Education Post Devolution,* Second Edition, Edinburgh University Press.

Hartley, D. (2004) Teacher's Performance, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20, 309-323.

Hatcher, R. (1994) Market Relationships and the Management of Teachers, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 15, 41-61.

Hay McBer, (2000) *Research into Teacher Effectiveness: A Model for Teacher Effectiveness, Research Report No 216*, London: DfEE.

Helsby, G. (1999) *Changing Teachers Work*, Buckingham: OU Press.

Hewton, E. (1982) Rethinking Educational Change, *Society for Research into Higher Education*, Guildford: Falmer Press.

HMIE (2007) HMIE Scotland website, www.hmie.gov.uk

Homes, M. and Wynne, E. (1989) *Making the School an Effective Community: Belief, Practice and Theory in School Administration*, Lewes: Falmer Press.

Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M. and West, M. (1994) *School Improvement in an Era of Change*, London: Cassell.

Hoyle, E. (1986) *The Politics of School Management*, Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton.

Hoyle, E. and John, P. (1995) *Professional Knowledge and Professional Practice*, London: Cassell.

Hoyle, E. and Wallace, M. (2007) Educational Reform: An Ironic Perspective, *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 35, 9, 23.

Hume, D. (1875) On the Independency of Parliament in Green, T.H. and Gross T.H. (Eds) *Essays, Moral, Political and Literary, Vol 1*, London: Longmans.

Huson, T. (1979) *The School in Questions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hyland, T. (1993) Professional Development and Competence Based Education, *Educational Studies*, 19, 1, 123-132.

Ironside, M. and Seifert, R. (1995) *Industrial Relations in Schools*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Jeffrey, B. and Woods, P. (1996) Feeling Deprofessionalised: The social construction of emotions during an OFSTED inspection, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26, 325-343.

Jennings, K. and Lomas, L. (2003) Implementing Performance Management for Headteachers in English Secondary Schools, *Educational Management and Administration*, 31, 4, 369-383.

Jeyes, G. (2003) The Local Governance of Education: an Operational Perspective. In *Bryce, T. and Humes, W. (2003) Scottish Education Post Devolution.* Second edition. Edinburgh University Press.

Juran, J.M. (1989) *Juran on Leadership for Quality*, New York, Macmillan.

Kellehear, A. (1993) *The Unintrustive Researcher*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Kendall, I. and Holloway, D. (2001) Education Policy in Savage, S.P. and Atkinson, R. (Eds) *Public Policy under Blair*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Kennedy, D. (2000) Another Century's End, Another Revolution for Higher Education in DeZure, D. (Ed) *Learning from Change*, Paul Chapman.

Kenway, J. and Bullen, E. (2001) *Consuming Children: Education – Entertainment Advertising*, Buckingham: OU Press.

Klein, R. (1995) *The New Politics of the NHS (3rd edition)*, London: Longmans.

Kogan, M. (1986) *Education Accountability: An Analytical Overview.* London. Hutchinson.

Kydd, .L (1996) Towards a Restructuring of Teacher's Professional Development in Kydd, L., Crawford, M. and Riches, C. (Eds) *Professional Development for Educational Management*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Ladwig, J. et.al. (1998) School Effects in Post Modern Conditions. In Slee, R. et.al. (1998) *School Effectiveness for Whom? Challenges to the School Effectiveness and School Improvement Movements.* London. Falmer.

Lansing, J.B., Ginsbery, G.P. and Braaten, K. (1961) *An Investigation of Response Error*, University of Illinois: Bureau of Economic and Business Research.

Lawlor, S. (1990) *Teachers Mistaught: Training in Theories of our Education Subjects*, London: Centre for Policy Studies.

Le Compte, M. and Preissle, J. (1993) *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research (Second Edition)*, London: Academic Press.

Le Grand, J. (1997) Knights, Knaves or Pawns? Human Behaviour and Social Policy, *Journal of Social Policy*, 26, 2, 149-169.

Lincoln, Y. (1995) Emerging Criteria for Quality in Qualitative and Interpretive Research, *Qualitative Inquiry,* 1, 3, 275-289.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guson, E.G. (1985) *Naturalistic Enquiry*, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Lingard, B. et.al.(1998) School Effects in Postmodern Conditions in Slee, R., Weiner, G. and Tomlinson, S. (eds), *School Effectiveness for Whom? Challenges to the School Effectiveness and School Improvement Movements*, London: Falmer.

Lingard, B., Hayes, D. and Mills, M. (2000) Developments in School-based Management: The Specific Case of Queensland, Australia, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40, 1, 6-30.

Lortie, D.C. (1969) The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching in Etzioni, A (ed) *The Semi-Professionals and their Organisation*, New York: Free Press.

Lyotard, J.F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester: MU Press.

Mahony, P. and Hextall, I. (2001) Performing and Conforming in Gleeson, D. and Husbands, C. (Eds), *The Performing School*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Marcouse, I., Gillespie, A., Martin, B., Surridge, M. and Wall, N. (1999) *Business Studies*, Abingdon: Hodder & Stoughton.

Marcus, G. (1998) *Ethnography through Thick and Thin,* Princeton NJ; Princeton University Press.

Macrae, S., Maguire, M., and Ball S., (1997) Competition, Choice and Hierarchy in a Post 16 Education and Training market. In Tomlinson, S. (Ed) *Education 14 – 19, Critical Perspectives.* London: Athlone.

Meng, J., (2009) *Saving the Teacher's Soul: Exorcising the Terrors of Performativity.* London Review of Education, Vol. 7, (2), p. 159 - 167

McKenzie, J. (2001) *Perform or Else. From Discipline to Performance*, London: Routledge.

McNess, E., Broadfoot, P., & Osborn, M. (2003) Is the Effective Compromising the Affective? *British Educational Research Journal,* 29(2), 243-257.

McPherson A. and Raab, C. (1988) *Governing Education.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Meyer, H. (2002) The New Managerealism in Education Management: Corporatisation or Organisational Learning? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40, 6, 534-551.

Miller, P. and Rose, N. (1990) Governing Economic Life, *Economy and Society*, 19, 1, 1-31.

Mishler, E.G. (1991) Representing Discourse: The Rhetoric of Transcription, *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1, 225-280.

Molnar, A. (2006) The Commercial Transformation of Public Education, *Journal of Education Policy, Sept 2006,* 21,5, 621-640.

Monbiot, G. (2002) *Schooling up for Sale*, The Guardian, 1st January.

Moore, A., Edwards, G., Halpin, D. and George, R. (2000) Compliance, Resistance and Pragmatism: The Reconstruction of School Teacher Identities in a Period of Intensive, Educational Reform, *British Educational Research Journal*, 28, 4.

Mortimore, P., Sammas, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D. and Ecob, R. (1988) *School Matters*, Wells: Open Books.

Murgatroyd, S. and Gray, H.L. (1984) Leadership and the Effective School in Harling, P. (Ed) *New Directions in Educational Leadership.* London: Falmer Press.

Neave, G. (1988) On the Cultivation of Quality, Efficiency & Enterprise: An Overview of Recent Trends in Higher Education in Western Europe from 1986 – 88, *European Journal of Education*, 23, p7.23.

New, C. (1988) Realism, Deconstruction and The Feminist Standpoint, *Journal for Theory and Social Behaviour,* 28, 4, 349-72.

Newman, F., Marks, H., Gamoran., A (1996) Authentic Pedagogy and Student Performance, *American Journal of Education,* 104 (4), 280 – 312.

Newton, J. (1998) *Feeding the Beast or Improving Quality*? Academic Staff Perceptions of Quality Assurance and Quality Monitoring. Paper presented at Higher Education Close up International Conference, 6-8th July 1998 University of Central Lancashire, Preston.

Nias, J. (1996) Thinking About Feeling: The Emotions of Teaching, *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 26, 293-306.

Nisbet, J. and Watt, J. (1984) Case Study. In Bell, J., Bush, T., Fox, A., Goodey, J. and Goulding, S. (Eds*) Conducting Small Scale Investigations in Educational Management*. London: Harper & Row.

Nixon, J., Martin, J., McKeown, P. and Ranson, S. (1996) *Encouraging Learning: Towards a Theory of the Learning School*, Buckingham: OU Press.

O'Day, J.A. (1996) Incentives and School Improvement. In Furnham and O'Day, J.A. (Eds), *Rewards and Reform: Creating Educational Incentives That Work,* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

O'Neill, J., Middlewood, D. and Glover, D. (1994*) Human Resource Management in Schools and Colleges*. Harlow: Longman.

Oldroyd, D., Elsher, D. and Poster, C. (1996*) Educational Management Today: A Concise Dictionary and Guide*, London: Paul Chapman.

Osborn, M., McNess, E. and Broadfoot, P. with Pollard, A. and Triggs, P. (2000) *What Teachers Do: Changing Policy and Practice: Primary Education*, London: Continuum.

Ozga, J. and Lawn, M. (1988) Schoolwork: Interpreting The Labour Process of Teaching, *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 9, 323-336.

Packwood, T. (1977) The School as a Hierarchy, *Educational Administration,* 5, 2, 1-6.

Packwood, T. (1984) The Introduction of Staff Responsibility for Subject Development in a Junior School in, Gouldery, S. et al (Eds), *Case Studies in Educational Management*. London: Harper & Row.

Packwood, T. (1989) Return to the Hierarchy, *Educational Management and Administration,* 17, 1, 9-15, Winter.

Peters, M., (2003) in Bryce, T.G.K., and Humes, W.M., *Scottish Education.* Second Edition Post Devolution. Edinburgh University Press.

Peters, M.A. (2004) Performative, Perform, and the Culture of Performance Knowledge Management in the New Economy, *Management in Education,* 18, 1, 35.

Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H. (1982) *In Search of Excellence*, Harper & Row: New York.

Pollard, A.B., Croll, P., Osborn, M., Abbot, D. (1994) *Changing English Primary Schools*, London: Cassell.

Power, M. (1994) *The Audit Explosion,* London: Sage

Power, M. (1997) *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reeves, J., Forde, C., O'Brien, J., Smith, P., Tomlinson H. (2002) *Performance Management in Education. Improvement and Practice*, Sage Publications.

Reich, C. (1991) The Law of the Planned Society, Quoted in Lueberman *Tyranny of Expertise*, 268.

Reynolds, D. & Cuttance, P. (1992) *School Effectiveness, Research, Policy and Practice.* Cassell

Riches, C. (1994a) Motivation in Bush, T. and West-Burnham, J. (Eds) *The Principles of Education Management*, Harlow: Longman.

Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (2003) *Qualitative Research Practice. A guide for Social Science Students and Researchers,* Sage Publications.

Ritzer, G. (2000) *The McDonaldisation of Society. New Century Education,* California: Pine Forge Press.

Roger, S. (1999) *Performance Management in Local Government. The Route to Best Value,* London: Financial Times/Pitman.

Rogers, L. and Badham, L. (1994) Evaluation in the Management Cycle in Bennett, N., Glatter, R. (Eds), *Improving Educational Management through Research and Consultancy*, London: Paul Chapman.

Ronan, W.W. and Prien, E.P. (1971*) Perspectives in the Measurement of Human Performance*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Rosenholtz, S.J. (1989) *Teachers Workplace: The Social Organisation of Schools*, New York: Teachers College Press.

Scheurich, J.J. (1995) A Postmodernist Critique of Research Interviewing, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8, 3, 239-52.

Scholz, R. and Tietje, O. (2002) *Embedded Case Study Methods. Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Knowledge,* Sage Publications.

Schon, D (1991) *The Reflective Practitioner. How Professionals Think in Action*, Ashgate.

Schuster, R. & Kindall, A. (1974) Management By Objectives – Where We Stand Today, *Human Resource Management*, 13, 1, 8-11.

Scott, W.R. (1998) *Organisations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*, Fourth Edition, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Shore, C. and Wright, S. (2000) Audit Cultures, in Strathern, M. (Ed) *Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, London: Routledge.

Simmons, J. and Iles, P. (2001) Performance Appraisals in Knowledge-Based Organisations. Implications for Management Education, *Int Journal of Management Education*, 2, 1, 3-18.

Smith, D. (1997) Comment on Hekman's "Truth & Method", *Signs,* 22, 2, 392-99.

Smith, P. (1995) On the Unintended Consequences of Publishing Performance Data in the Public Sector, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 18, 2/3, 277-310.

Smyth, J. (2000), Reclaiming Social Capital Through Critical Teaching, *Elementary School Journal*, 100, 5, 491-511.

Smyth, J. and Shacklock, G. (1998) *Re-making Teaching. Ideology, Policy and Practice*, London: Routledge.

Sockett, H. (1980) Accountability: The Contemporary Issues, In Sockett, H. (Ed) *Accountability in the English Educational System*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.

SOED (1994b) *5-14: A Practical Guide for Teachers and Primary and Secondary Schools*, Edinburgh: HMSO.

SOEID (1998b) *Proposals for Developing a Framework for CPD for the Teaching Profession of Scotland. Consultation Document.* Edinburgh: SOEID.

SOEID (1999) *Standards and Quality in Scottish Schools 1995-98*, a report by HM Inspectors of Schools, Edinburgh: SOEID.

Southworth, G. (1985) *Development of Staff in Primary Schools (some ideas and implications).*British Journal of In-Service Education, 10,3,6-15.

Stoll, L. and Fink, D. (1996) *Changing Our Schools: Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Buckingham: OU Press.

Stoll, L., Fink, D. and Earl, L. (2003) *International Journal of Education Management, 1997,* Vol 11, 6, Leggate and Thomson.

Stoll, L., Fink, D. and Earl, L. (2003) *It's About Learning (and it's about time). What's In It For Schools?* Routledge: Falmer.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research,* London: Sage.

Stromquist, N.P and Monkman, K. (Eds) (2000) *Globalisation and Education: Integration and Consternation Across Cultures,* New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Taylor, S. and Field, D. (2003) *Sociology of Health and Health Care*, 3rd Edition, Blackwell.

Teacher Training Agency (1998a) Address by Anthea Millett, TTA Chief Executive, Corporate Plan Conference, 19th May.

Teelken, C. (1999), Market Mechanisms in Education; School Choice in the Netherlands, England and Scotland in a Comparative Perspective, *Comparative Education*, 35, 3, 283-302.

Titmuss, R. (1971) *The Gift Relationship,* London: Allen & Unwin.

Torrington, D. and Weightman, J. (1989) *The Reality of School Management.* Oxford. Blackwell.

Van Meter, D. and Van Horn, C. (1975), The Policy Implementation Process; A Conceptual Framework for Administration and Society, 6, 4, 445-88.

Varey, R.J. (1995) A Model of Internal Marketing for Building and Sustaining a Competitive Service Advantage, *Journal of Marketing and Management*, 11, 41-54.

Walker, R. (1980), Making Sense and Losing Meaning: Problems of Selection in Education Case Study. In Simons, H. (Ed) *Towards a Science of the Singular University of East Anglia*, Centre for Applied Research in Education.

Wallace, M. and Hall, V. (1994) *Inside the SMT: Teamwork in Secondary School Management*, London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Weber, M. (1989) Legal Authority in a Bureaucracy, in Bush, T. (Ed) *Managing Education: Theory and Practice*, Milton Keynes: OU Press.

Weick, K. (2001) *Making Sense of the Organisation*, Blackwell Publishing.

Weir, D. (2003) Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education. In Bryce, T. and Humes, W. (2003) *Scottish Education Post Devolution.* Second Edition. Edinburgh University Press.

Wexter, P. (1986) America During the Crisis in Sharp, R (Ed) *Capitalism, Crisis and Schooling*, South Melbourne: MacMillan.

Whitty, G. (2000), Teacher Professionalism in New Times, *Journal of In-Service Education*, 26, 2, 159-185.

Whitty, G. (2002) *Making Sense of Education Policy*, Paul Chapman Publishing.

Whitty, G. et al (1998) *Devolution and Choice in Education. The School, the State and the Market*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Whitty, G., Power, S. and Halpin, D. (1998) *Devolution and Choice in Education. The School, The State and the Market,* Buckingham: OU Press.

Wilkinson, G. (2004) *McSchools for a McWorld? Mediating Global Pressures With a McDonaldising Education Policy Response*, Scarborough School of Education, University of Hull.

Williams, G. (1988) Experimentation in Reflective Practice: A Conceptual Framework for Managers in Highly Professional Organisations. Paper presented at annual conference of British Academy of Management. Cardiff, 19th September 1988.

Williams, G. and Blackstone, T. (1983) Response to Adversity. *Society for Research Into Higher Education.* Guildford.

Willmott, H. (1995) Managing The Academics: Commodifications and Control in the Development of University Education in the UK, *Human Relations*, 48, 9, 993-1027.

Woods, E. (2003) *The Changing Educational Landscape; with particular reference to the Education Act 2002, the governance of education and the emerging role of the private sector*. Unpublished memo. University of Warwick, Institute of Education.

Woods, P. (2006) *Qualitative Research*, Faculty of Education, University of Plymouth.

Woods, P. and Jeffrey, B. (1997), Creative Teaching in the Primary National Curriculum in, Helsby, G. and McCulloch, G. (Eds), *Teachers and The National Curriculum*, London: Cassell.

Wynne, H. (2004) *Rethinking The Teachers Role in Assessment*, BERA Conference Paper, 18.

Yin, R.K. (1994) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2nd Edition), London: Sage.